

The Classical Review

JUNE 1910

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

ANCIENT IMPERIALISM.

[On May 6 the Oxford members of the Classical Association invited their friends in Oxford to two meetings in connexion with the Association and with the hope of making it better known in the University. At the first of these meetings, held in the afternoon at All Souls, with Sir Wm. Anson in the chair, Mr. S. H. Butcher, chairman of the Association, and Prof. Gilbert Murray spoke on the claims of classical literature to the attention of the world. At the second meeting, held at 8.30 p.m. in Magdalen College Hall, with the Vice-Chancellor in the chair, five Oxford historians spoke on the subject of Ancient Imperialism, in special reference to Lord Cromer's January address to the C.A., and Lord Cromer followed. Many wishes have been expressed that the addresses should be printed, and they are accordingly given here with a few corrections by the authors. The programme was that Prof. Haverfield should introduce and speak on the Roman Empire, the Master of Balliol should discuss the Roman Republic, Mr. E. R. Bevan and the Rev. E. M. Walker Greek Imperialism, and Mr. D. G. Hogarth the general assimilation of subject races. These five speakers were restricted to 8 minutes each, and all of them kept more or less near this limit. The reader will understand that he has before him, not the report of a debate, but six addresses prepared beforehand on a given scheme.]

I. INTRODUCTION, ROMAN EMPIRE.

LAST January Lord Cromer gave the Classical Association as his presidential address a very remarkable discussion on 'Imperialism, Ancient and Modern'—which he then published in fuller form as a book.¹

¹ *Imperialism, Ancient and Modern*, by the Earl of Cromer (London: Murray). 2s. 6d.

The book aroused wide interest, not least in Oxford, and, at this meeting of Oxford members of the Association and their friends, it seemed suitable, and it has fortunately proved possible, to continue the discussion with the aid and presence of Lord Cromer himself.

Imperialism is a word of many meanings. To-night it does not include the ethics of conquest or the right of one race to rule another; this meeting will not be asked to wave flags or to disparage the setting sun. We deal with the forces or groups of forces which in all times and places tend to create, assist, hinder, or destroy Empires. From this point of view the discussion has (I think) special importance for University lecturers and teachers of history. The chief work of such men—apart from the indispensable but technical duties of research and of training future historians—is to widen the political imaginations of their audiences, and to make them realise that, quite apart from the personal factors of any moment, there are forces and tendencies not easily stated except in the abstract, but able, if ignored, to take very concrete vengeance. I am not, be it observed, recommending the study of history on the ground that it aids us to form political prophecies or draw political analogies. It does that, no doubt. But its real value lies in helping us to realise the existence and the true

character of various forces—it may be of geography or race feeling or religion or much else—with which we, like our predecessors, have to deal in our everyday politics.

Young students of ancient history do not, I think, always recognise this. They know—in general—little of the institutions of their own land or age—far less, probably, than their predecessors 80 years ago—though they know much more of the personalities, in all senses of that word. Though they often possess a good knowledge of ancient history, a comparison between Greece or Rome and the things of their own day has little meaning for them. I remember once insisting, through a course of lectures, on various likenesses and unlikenesses of the Roman provinces to British India. At the end, one of the audience came up and asked if he might put me a question. ‘You seem’ (he said) ‘to know something about India: can you advise me which would be the best province for me to choose if I get into the Indian Civil Service?’ It is, therefore, a special service to education when one who has a unique right, as Lord Cromer has, to discuss the conditions of modern Empire, points out the actual bearings of ancient history on our understanding of our own problems.

We should have liked to have included in our list of speakers some modern historians. But time is short, and we who begin the discussion have to prepare, and not to stop, the way. Moreover, the Classical Association is after all classical. So we have done no more than add to four local names that of a distinguished non-resident historian, Mr. Bevan.

The part of our subject which falls to me is the Roman Empire. Of this Empire I shall assert, for most of its life and over most of its lands, that it merits praise from the most uncompromising foes of despotism. I stand with Gibbon and with Mommsen in the old belief. The empire of the second and early third centuries brought (I think) more happiness to more of the known world than any age till the French Revolution, and that happiness was not confined to a dominant race or to an upper class. The Empire made mistakes enough—though in

counting these mistakes, I would urge that dates and places be carefully studied. Instances of the misgovernment or the sins or the depopulation of the Empire must not be sought from the Republic, nor must the aristocratic scandals of a capital be treated as typical of a whole realm. And I would further urge on those who judge an Empire by its blunders, that Empires are harder to manage than we at home usually think. It may well be doubted whether even to-day any single nation is quite equal to the ceaseless demand for able men, to the strain on the organisation, to the vast famines and pestilences and popular discontents, which are the evil heritage of imperial rule. We have much more to learn before any empire will show the happiness of a Holland or a Switzerland. But Holland and Switzerland are geographical accidents: and human nature must alter much before a whole world of them would be tolerable.

In praising the Empire, two concessions must be made. First, its performance was unequal. In the west—in Europe as far east as Scupi—and in Algeria and Tunis Rome found in great part peoples racially akin to the Italian, and peoples, too, which were still uncivilised; these rapidly became Italian, and in time formed modern Europe. That was a great work. But in the east Rome found the old coherent forces of Greek civilisation and of the yet older Oriental culture. It did not change these: to the Greek lands it brought a measure of good government, but not progress, and though many Greeks passed into the Roman service and some into the Senate, the east did not become Romanised. Here Rome met that most serious of all obstacles to assimilation, races whose thoughts and affections and traditions and civilisation had crystallised into definite form. This is the true obstacle to Imperial assimilation and even to peaceful rule. ‘To cast the nations old Into another mould’ is not really given to human endeavour. It does not so much matter whether the crystallisation has been caused by a political religion or a national sentiment or undying memories of the past: the point is the coherence which results. In India, I am told, we might assimilate in some sort the uncivilised hill-

tribes, if geography let us bring sufficient influences to work. But the civilised Hindoos and Mohammedans have crystallised. They offer to us somewhat the same resistance as the Croats at Agram or the Poles in Posen offer to various European powers. In such cases the civilisation of the dominant race does not act as solvent or assimilator. Its power to do that is limited to the uncivilised or incoherent units. Coherence is, I think, an even greater bar than colour—on which latter question Lord Cromer has some most excellent remarks in his book. Colour, after all, has gradations. The northern white must contrast sharply with the tropical black, but the darker races of the Mediterranean do not feel so distant from either. In the Roman world a political colour-sense hardly existed: the nearest parallel to it was the Roman horror of the slave-born, which produced the curious and persistent restrictions on the *libertini*. Still, it must be noted that races like the negroes were rare in the Roman Empire; they were, therefore, neither dangerous nor obtrusive, and this motive for a colour-sense was absent. Moreover, Roman law long forbade the Egyptian peasants to become Roman citizens, and in a way recognised their racial unlikeness.

Lastly, I wish to concede this also, that, left to itself, the Roman empire would have presently failed. Probably it would have become like China: that, at least, is suggested by certain changes in the guild and serf systems, which point to an arrested culture and a caste system. That is the worst crystallisation of all. But at a remote period the barbarians of central Asia, driven from their homes (it may be) by increasing drought, began to move upon both China and the west. China and Rome alike built walls against them. The Chinese built the better walls, and we are here to-night.

F. HAVERFIELD.

II. ROMAN REPUBLIC.

Lord Cromer has set us the problem¹—How was it that Rome so greatly succeeded, where modern nations so con-

spicuously fail, in uniting her subjects with herself? I propose to offer a suggestion as to one reason for the difference. Let us see how the matter appeared to a Roman Consul who was also a Greek historian, and whose name indicates his position between the two peoples—Dio Cassius. Looking back early in the 3rd century on the accomplished fact, Dio describes the goal of the movement as follows²—‘That when they share in the citizenship, they may be our faithful confederates, as if they were all inhabitants of one single City, and that our City, and esteem this in very truth a City, and their own towns only its territories and villages.’

Thus the Roman world was, in idea, not one nation, but one city. The difference is very important, and here, as I believe, we may recognise one great advantage which the Romans possessed over ourselves in carrying out the work of assimilation; an advantage involved in the conception of citizenship which they shared with the Greek States, as opposed to the modern bond of allegiance to a common sovereign. In the *πόλις* every full citizen is a portion of the Sovereign. His citizenship is a citizenship of personal privilege. Every state, so far as its power goes, would divide the human race into two opposed species, the privileged citizen and the non-privileged alien. This is as true for Seriphus as for Athens, and it is not her fault if to be a Seriphian is not esteemed the pinnacle of human greatness.

If the state acquires conquests, the conquered are still aliens, subject aliens, between whom and the citizens there is a great gulf fixed, a gulf which tends to become deeper if the growing power of the supreme state causes the exclusive privilege of the citizens to become more and more valuable. So far we have no opportunity for basing imperialism on anything more permanent than the force of the ruling state. ‘Quid aliud,’ says Claudius,³ ‘exitio Lacedaemoniis et Atheniensibus fuit quamvis armis pollerent nisi quod victos

² Dio. *Hist.* lii. 19. 6.

³ Tac. *Ann.* xi. 24. 5.

¹ *Ancient and Modern Imperialism*, p. 115.

pro alienigenis arcerent.' It was the great original conception of Rome that it was possible to use the very depth of the gulf to enhance the importance of the bridge which she built over it.

Now what are the possibilities of the two doctrines as to the bond of union in a state? The modern idea, that of common allegiance to the Crown, is an admirable machinery for a colonising power; it supplies a happy mean between cutting loose your colonists, as did the Greeks, and trying to govern them, as did the Spaniards. The tie is independent of administrative interference. The Englishman, the Australian, and the Canadian may each work out his destiny and regulate his life by the laws and conditions of his own community, but the doctrine that all equally owe loyalty to the King preserves without friction a healthy sentiment of Union which renders common defence and mutual assistance a natural duty and a normal result.

But how will the same system work in the presence of conquest? You have given up the distinction between citizen and subject; and so all are in law on a level as subjects of the Crown, with the same claims on the paternal bounty of the State. Thus the conquest has to be swallowed whole; admission to the ranks of the conquering nation is pressed on the vanquished at a moment when they are most inclined to dislike it, and this dislike may be propagated through generations and may be as great a bar to unity as was the exclusiveness of Spartans or Athenians. Poles refuse to become Germans or Slavs to become Austrians: the Irish regard as a wrong that Act of Union which corresponds to the admission of the Italians into the Roman State by the *Lex Julia*, a boon which the Italian allies sought for with years of importunate petition, and which they looked on as the charter of their liberties when they had at last obtained it at the point of the sword.

The Romans had a much less paternal view of the duties of conquerors. The Gauls, says Cicero,¹ had been 'defeated in great wars to the end that they might

always obey the Roman people.' The conquered enemy was an inferior creature, but one capable of being transformed at the touch of the magic wand of the law. The Sicilian or the Gaul never for a moment supposed that he was the equal of his conqueror. He was on the wrong side of an arbitrary line of distinction, subject to the axe and the rods, while the Roman might not be touched in life or person. The legal barrier between citizen and subject was too absolute to require reinforcing by any 'natural' distinctions of race, colour or language. But the very circumstance that it was an arbitrary line enabled a subject to be passed over it by arbitrary enactment, by the *fiat* of the Sovereign *Populus Romanus*. Thus it became possible to set up the citizenship of privilege as a goal to which the élite of the subjects might attain by doing good service to their masters or by winning their favour. It is noticeable that the enfranchised subject generally like the manumitted slave took the Gentile name of the patron by whose advocacy he had obtained the citizenship. Hence the number of Julii, Claudii and Flavii in the provinces.² It was a happy thought likewise that in the Latin communities a local magistracy was the path to the Roman citizenship. On the other hand, fraudulently to usurp the citizenship was a capital offence. No pains were spared to make the citizenship a prize, and as a prize it proved the greatest solvent, not only of the barrier between the Roman State and its subjects, but of the barriers of mutual exclusiveness between the subject States themselves. To become a Roman was the object of ambition alike for the Syrian and for the Gaul, and in attaining it each became the fellow-citizen of the other.

I know of only one statesman in modern times who firmly took his stand on the ancient ideal of citizenship, and that one was President Paul Kruger; it has always been my conviction that the real meaning of the Boer War is to be found in the necessary conflict between the two ideals, the English doctrine that all the white

¹ *Pro Font.* 2, 13.

² See *Ancient and Modern Imperialism*, p. 99, n. 1.

inhabitants of the country should be on equal footing, and the Boer doctrine that the Englishman was an inferior creature, just because he was not a citizen, and that he ought not to be allowed the honour of becoming a Boer until he had earned it by years or even generations of acquiescence in a subject position. President Kruger's mistake was not in the efficiency of the machinery which he set up; it would have made all South Africa into a Boer Republic, if he had been allowed a century or so to work it. But he forgot that Englishmen could not accept the degraded *status* of subjects among citizens, and that the British Government could not submit to leave them sitting as suppliants on the lowest step of the altar. (Lord Cromer, interposing: 'He forgot Lord Roberts.') The circumstance that the Boers seem now heartily to have accepted the modern doctrine of equality in the sight of the law seems the best augury for the future of the country.

It is interesting to notice how many difficulties were solved by the ancient conception of citizenship. For instance the controversy which raged over the 'Ilbert Bill,' the question of the jurisdiction of a native magistrate in India over Europeans, would have seemed ludicrous to a Roman. He would have said—'if the native be a subject it is manifestly improper that he should judge a citizen: if he has been made a citizen, it is equally obvious that there can be no objection to his doing so.' In the same way with marriage: The *jus conubii* is a purely artificial right. The Roman man or woman may contract marriage with any citizen, of whatever race or colour, and there were doubtless differences in these respects amongst slaves enfranchised in Rome, but not with any alien, however civilised, unless the *jus conubii* is there by special privilege. This privilege again is simply a matter of law: it exists with certain communities, as for instance with Latin towns: it exists for certain individuals, as when Vespasian¹

¹ 'Jus tribuo conubii, dumtaxat cum singulis et primis uxoribus, ut etiamsi peregrini juris feminas matrimonio suo junxerint, proinde liberos tollant, ac si ex duobus civibus Romanis natos.'

grants to each of his discharged veterans the right to contract marriage with a foreign woman.

Now to turn to India: we have no such prize to give as that of the Roman citizenship, and so we have not the most potent instrument of assimilation. We have no solvent before which the walls of partition, colour, race, religion, social prejudices will go down. It follows that we cannot make Englishmen of the Hindoos, nor can we make of them an united Indian people; nor again, while they remain divided as they are, can we leave them to be destroyed by internal anarchy. And so we come back by another path to the unfortunate position of the Athenians and Spartans. We must remain an army of occupation, an alien conquering race, not because we keep off the conquered, but because we cannot get at them.

While we recognise the limits of our possibilities, we need not be appalled by them. Lord Cromer² has quoted Prof. Gwatkins as saying 'Rome was the first of the Great Empires, and almost the only one to our own time which turned subjects into citizens, and ruled them for their own good, and not for selfish gain.' The first of these results is impossible for us; the second, if we will possess our souls in patience, we may realise far more than the Romans ever did.

J. L. STRACHAN DAVIDSON.

III. GREEKS AND BARBARIANS.

Lord Cromer's book is based upon the great fact that the modern antithesis between Europeans and the people of other civilisations is analogous to, and in a sense the continuation of, the old antithesis between Hellenes and 'barbaroi.' Just as the Hellene felt himself the representative of a culture which distinguished him from all the rest of the world, so does the European of to-day. Just as in ancient times when the East, after the legions had thundered past, 'plunged in thought again,' it was not the old thought, but a thought vastly modified by the Greek schoolmaster, philosopher, rhetorician, so to-day when

² *Ancient and Modern Imperialism*, p. 51.

Europeans have won material predominance, they have made it their deliberate policy to impart European education. Obviously then there is a great resemblance between the relation of the Greek to the barbarian, and our own relation to Oriental races. In some ways however there are striking differences. It is about these I want to speak to-night. It seems to me then that in one way the Greek was much more liberal-minded than we are; in another way much more narrow-minded. He was more liberal-minded in his comparative freedom from racial antipathy. This is just the factor which so complicates and embitters our problem to-day. Our system of education in the East goes on the theory that our form of culture is transferable, and yet when we have drawn men of alien races within our pale, we find a difficulty in regarding them as full members of our society. Probably the social exclusiveness of Englishmen does as much, or even more, to create resentment than any political grievance.¹ So far as this exclusiveness is simply *bourgeois* stupidity, intolerant of the unfamiliar, it is wholly regrettable. But we have to remember, if we are to be fair, certain things which made it much easier for the Greek to be liberal. In the first place, the Orientals with whom he came into contact were nearer to him, geographically and in complexion. Secondly, Greek civilisation was only a few generations old, and had not branched off so widely or developed the elaborate complexities of modern culture. Thirdly, the Greek was very deficient in the historical sense. The ideas, so omnipresent with us, of biological and historical evolution, of mental varieties, hardly came within his consciousness. We see much more clearly how intimately a particular type of social and mental life is connected with a particular series of historical antecedents, and to some extent the slowness of Europeans to believe in the real Europeanisation of Asiatics rests upon

the true perception of the impossibility of transplanting ideas and institutions which have grown up in one soil straight away into another and alien one. How little all that was realised by the Greeks may be seen in the later Greek philosophy, especially in Stoicism, the really popular philosophy of the Hellenistic age. The *Reason*, *Logos*, *Nous* was something ready-made and fixed, inherent in all men from the beginning; to all men who followed it, it would dictate a uniform line of conduct, so that in this respect distinctions of race and social standing would not come into consideration at all. (Kaerst, in his last volume, has drawn attention to this absence of the 'historisches Moment' in Stoicism.) Perhaps to-day we err on the other side of laying such stress on the varieties of human mentality as to forget the underlying humanity which makes all akin.

The attitude of the ancient Greeks finds an interesting illustration in a quotation which Strabo makes from the philosopher Eratosthenes. Aristotle was credited with having given Alexander the advice to bear himself towards the Greeks as *primus inter pares* (ἡγεμονικῶς), but towards the barbarians as an absolute master (δεσποτικῶς). Eratosthenes finds fault; it would be better, he says, to distinguish men by moral character, not by race. There are many undesirable sorts of Greeks and many civilised (ἀρρεῖοι) barbarians, such as the Indians and Persians. This passage was no doubt in the mind of Plutarch, or whoever it was that wrote the first of the two tracts *De Alexandri fortuna aut virtute*. This writing is the most emphatic expression of the Greek's consciousness of a mission to the world, as a civilising power. We must not, he says, make the distinction of Hellene and barbarian depend upon race or fashion of dress, but upon virtue and vice. Nor can it be said that this was only a dream of philosophers and men of letters. As a matter of fact, the Orientals who adopted Hellenic culture in the age after Alexander do not seem to have had race prejudice against them. How many of the names in Susemihl's history of Greek literature in the Hellenistic age are those of Phoenicians! One Phoenician,

¹ Lord Cromer observed, later on in the evening, that he agreed with this view, 'but (he added) it has to be remembered that the exclusiveness is not all on one side.'

of Carthage, Clitomachus, known to his fellow-countrymen as Hasdrubal, sat in the seat of Plato, as president of the Academy.

And yet in one way, the Greek seems to have been narrower than the modern European. If he had less racial prejudice, he had greater cultural prejudice. In the very phrase of Plutarch just quoted, that the distinction of *Hellene* and *barbarian* must be taken to have reference not to race, but to *virtue and vice*, there is not only large-heartedness, but an ingenuous assumption. The Greek could not easily bring himself to think of any other form of culture as worth anything beside his own. The expression of Eratosthenes seems to have gone beyond the ordinary feeling of the Greeks in asserting Indians and Persians to be fully civilised as they are already. It is noteworthy that the sentiment is not repeated in Plutarch's tract, where Indians and Persians are only a field ripe for Hellenic propaganda. There was, it is true, a feeling of awe at the great antiquity of Babylonian and Egyptian wisdom—a sort of emotional thrill. There was the theory current since the days of Herodotus which traced back the beginnings of Greek religion and philosophy to Egypt and the East. The theory, as far as philosophy was concerned, provoked vehement contradiction. Diogenes Laertius opens his work by attacking it and asserting that philosophy has a good Hellenic origin. And even where the theory was held, it seems rather to have stirred the imagination vaguely than to have prompted any serious study of non-Hellenic civilisations. It is significant that even the Greek authors who wrote about Oriental antiquities did not take the trouble to learn the Oriental languages. I do not know that we ever find a Greek learning a foreign language from any scientific interest. Here our attitude is undoubtedly more wide-minded.

It is with the spread of Christianity that the non-Hellenic languages and nationalities begin to assert themselves against all-enveloping Hellenism. We get the revolt in the Assyrian Christian Tatian who bitterly attacks the Hellenic mythology

in the name of 'barbarian philosophy'—so he styles the Jewish-Christian teaching. We get it in the growth of Coptic, Armenian, Syriac literature in which old languages, after centuries of suppression, come to life again as the vehicles of Oriental Christianity.

E. R. BEVAN.

IV. GREEK IMPERIALISM.

My remarks will be addressed to the position that Imperialism plays no part in Greek History; that the conception of Imperialism was wholly foreign to the Greek mind, so foreign that the Greek language did not contain any expression to convey the idea. I am not prepared to find the missing word; but I think we can find in the history of Greece both the idea and the thing. When the greatest of Greek historians makes Pericles boast 'Ελλήνων ὅτι Ἕλληνες πλείστον δὴ ἤρξαμεν, we feel that we are not far from the spirit of Imperialism; and when the greatest of Greek orators describes his native city as ἀεὶ περὶ πρωτείων καὶ τιμῆς καὶ δόξης ἀγωνιζομένη, we may trace in these words the temper of an imperial race. To find the thing, we need not look to Macedon (though, at the present day, most historians would allow the Greek race a larger share in Alexander than Grote was prepared to concede); we must look to the opposite end of the Greek world; to a land, a people, and a ruler, whose claim to be genuinely Greek has never been impugned. An empire which included the whole of Greek Sicily, much of Greek Italy, and something else besides, was a great empire, if we judge it by the scale of Greek History; and an empire which lasted half a century was, if judged by the same scale, more than a brief and transitory episode. The career of Dionysius proves what the Greek could accomplish in the way of Imperialism, when the conditions were favourable; *i.e.*, under a monarchical system, and in the presence of the constant menace of a foreign peril. If we turn from the Western Mediterranean to the Ægean, we find an empire of a different type. Why was the empire of

Athens so different in character from the Roman Empire, or from our own? Why did an empire, not dependent, like that of Dionysius, upon the hazard of a single life, last less than three-quarters of a century? Three reasons may be suggested. In the first place the principles upon which it was based were contradictory. Imperial Athens was a democracy with democracies for her subjects. That liberty which she claimed as the indefeasible right of her own *δῆμος* ('perfect liberty to manage their own affairs,' in Adam Smith's phrase) she denied to the *δῆμος* of the states over which she ruled. In the second place, the tyrant city, like the individual tyrant, never succeeded in legitimating its authority. It is a commonplace that the Greek tyrant remained outside the constitution; that he failed to invest his *de facto* sovereignty with legal sanctions. In the same way, the Athenian state shrank from the use of the term 'empire.' In theory the empire was an alliance, and the subjects were allies. In official documents, at any rate, imperial formulæ (e.g. *ξύμμαχοι ἐν ἀρχουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι*) are rare and late. In legal fictions there are always latent possibilities of mischief. Finally, it must never be forgotten that the empire of Athens rested upon the support of a political party. It was as true of the fifth century B.C. as of the fourth, that in every Greek state there were two cities—the city of those who have, and the city of those who covet what the others have. There seems to have been a working agreement between the demagogues at Athens and the *προστάται τοῦ δήμου* (the leaders of the 'Have-Nots') in the subject-states. I am afraid that the evidence seems to show that Athenian justice was sometimes prostituted to political ends. There are few more graphic touches to be found in ancient literature than in the passage in that curious treatise on the constitution of Athens, which once passed under the name of Xenophon, in which the writer, himself a contemporary, describes the way in which the aristocrats in the subject-states, when summoned to Athens to stand their trial upon some trumped-up charge, were compelled to pay court to the mob of

jurors, the *γέροντες ἡλιασταί*. He depicts them as hanging about the purlieus of the courts, as flattering and fawning upon the jurymen and employing all the arts of conciliation. Yet these were men who were proud of their blue blood; perhaps, like Hecataeus, reckoning back their pedigree to a god in the sixteenth generation; and justly proud of a great tradition of culture and of manners. They had good reason to know that the Athenian law-courts might be employed against them as a terrible engine of oppression. We can imagine their sentiments towards those whose favours they were compelled to court; the sentiments of Coriolanus towards the Roman mob. But we must not be too hard upon Athens. The writer of the treatise to which I have referred predicted that, if ever the propertied classes got the upper hand, the days of the Athenian empire would be numbered. The moment came when they got their chance, and the prediction was fulfilled.

REV. E. M. WALKER.

V. ASSIMILATION.

I wish to speak very briefly on a subject which was treated at considerable length in Lord Cromer's address, namely the *Assimilation of subjects by Imperial peoples*. Lord Cromer compared with great force and justice the Roman Empire with other empires, notably our own, in respect of such assimilation: and with equal justice he pointed out certain cardinal reasons why Rome attained to a measure of success which has been denied to modern powers. One of these reasons stands out pre-eminently. But for certain comparatively small communities, such as the Jewish (with which Rome failed as conspicuously as any modern power), she had neither national unities nor cohesive social systems to deal with; while, at the same time, those great social weapons, Christianity and Islam, had yet to be developed. In this fortune one later imperial power has rivalled her, and this power alone has attained something like her success. That power is the Ottoman Turk. Overrunning, as Rome did, regions inhabited by broken

remnants of peoples, destitute of any coherent social system, or spirit of unity, the warlike tribal union of the Turks brought with it the strong and simple social system of Islam, and so effectually assimilated the majority of the conquered people, that they regard themselves as Osmanli to this day. Even Christianity—be it said the imperfect and often merely superficial Christianity of the Eastern half of the Roman world—did not prevail against it; and it is roughly true that the limits ultimately set to its assimilative action were limits imposed consciously by the Turks themselves, with the object of preserving their own privileged position, and of securing the continued existence of a Gibeonite population within their borders. But I will try to go one step farther than Lord Cromer went, and ask, what did this Roman imperial assimilation mean? If it meant what I think it did, is it what those mean by it who deplore our own ill-success in assimilation, and enjoin on us to mend our ways in the interests of our imperial permanence? Let me come straight to my point. The Romanising of the ancient cosmos is not a conspicuous phenomenon before the third century, A.D., at earliest. But is not another phenomenon equally conspicuous in that epoch—the cosmopolitanisation of Rome? To use no other proofs, it is the century in which a Syrian and an Arab were Emperors of Rome. In a word, this assimilation, was, it seems, as much imposed on Rome as imposed by her, and the Empire of Rome was already passing into the Roman Empire. The peoples which Rome had dominated were dominating her, though in her own name, and the Romans, properly so-called, had ceased, by their own success in assimilation, to be an imperial people at all.

It is often said, that the great bar to success in imperial assimilation, is Pride of Race, issuing generally in contempt of colour. This may be of varying degrees of intensity between the attitude of a southern Anglo-Saxon in the United States towards a nigger, and the attitude of a northern Anglo-Saxon to a *dago*: but it is always contempt. Now, if this be so, what about Rome? Her literature of the late Republic

and early Empire is strongly inspired by such Pride of Race. You may find ample evidence of it in Virgil, in Horace, and in Juvenal, coupled with its necessary corollary, contempt of other races. Yet Rome ended by assimilation. Look back in history to the Greeks. I let the little so-called Empires of free Greece go by, and pass to the first Greek Empire on a great scale, that of Alexander. The Conqueror himself, as all the world knows, made repeated efforts to blend Macedonians and Greeks with his Oriental subjects. His attitude is neither here nor there. He had the mania of Universal Empire in his soul, and at most was an Imperialist Whig, who wanted the world levelled up, so he might remain exalted above it. But it is very much to the point, that he met at every attempt, whether on the Caspian shore, in Afghanistan, in Bactria, or on his return to Susa, with the strongest opposition possible, based on sheer Macedonian and Greek Pride of Race. Yet within two centuries after his death, the Greek was forming, in Egypt, in Syria, and even farther East, that same sort of amalgam with the non-Greek Oriental which he forms at this day.

The lesson of history, then (for what it is worth), seems to be that all imperial peoples have begun with a period of non-assimilation, or at least of no conscious desire to assimilate. They have passed to a second stage of desire to assimilate, and even, as time goes on, to accommodate themselves to their subjects. On that has followed a third stage of active assimilation, exerted, however, as much by their subjects on them, as *vice versa*, and resulting ultimately in the production of a more or less complete social uniformity, which is the greatest common measure of former rulers and former subjects. In a fourth and last stage the original ruling race has ceased to be imperial.

Our own Empire is still young—not two centuries old. We are still in the first stage of Imperialism, or at farthest, at the opening of the second. Rome attained her conspicuous success in assimilation in the third stage. If ever we reach that third stage—I do not say that, under the different

conditions of modern politics we shall reach it, but if we do—then there will be a sufficient basis for comparison between the two Empires; but not before. At present the comparison is not altogether valid.

As I am not standing here to prophesy, so I do not mean to moralise. I do not offer an opinion which is the highest imperial ideal—to look forward to taking the mother's position among grown-up and independent nations which we have brought forth, or to aim at maintaining a matriarchal sway over nations always adolescent but never adult. I wish only to emphasise two points, that the comparison of ancient and modern Empire in respect of assimilation is probably misleading because premature; and that, so far as the lesson of history goes, success in assimilation has not been hitherto a condition of imperial permanence.

D. G. HOGARTH.

VI. HISTORY AND POLITICS.

In the very brief remarks which I am about to address to you, I have to claim a full measure of your indulgence, for the real truth is that my thoughts have recently been so much occupied with the treatment which is likely to be accorded to the senate of the United Kingdom that they have been, to some extent, diverted from the proceedings, whether of senators or Emperors who lived some twenty centuries ago. I think, however, I may say that the main object I had in view in contrasting ancient and modern systems of Imperialism has been attained. That object was to draw attention to the matter, and to elicit the opinions of others, who most assuredly in respect of certain branches of this very wide subject, are far better acquainted with the facts than myself, and therefore far more qualified to draw accurate conclusions from them. The very interesting and instructive discussion to which we have just listened affords abundant testimony that this object has been achieved.

I will not make any attempt to range over the numerous points which have been raised in the course of this discussion. I cannot pretend to that intimate knowledge

with classical history and literature which would alone enable me to deal with them off-hand. I trust, however, I may be excused for indulging in a certain feeling of self-congratulation that I have passed through what is, to me, the somewhat terrifying ordeal of Oxford criticism, without being condemned for any very heinous offences. Let me add that on one point, even before I came here to-day, I had come to the conclusion that if I had to write my humble essay over again, I should modify its language. I admit that, being perhaps to some extent led away by the brilliant work of Mr. Ferrero, I may have done somewhat less than justice to the spirit which animated Roman Imperialism. That Imperialism, as we all know, was ushered into the world by the first Punic war, which left Rome the undisputed mistress of the Mediterranean. It then, as it would appear, passed through three phases. During the first period, the Senate displayed an amount of political insight and subtle tenacity of purpose which rendered it, in the words of its most recent historian, Mr. Heitland: 'The most efficient public body in the politics of the ancient world.' There is a line of Ennius quoted by Mr. Heitland which shows the sentiments then entertained by the subjects of Rome towards their Imperial mistress. Ennius, you will remember, was a Greek, and a native of Rudiae in Calabria:

'Nos sumus Romani, qui fuimus ante Rudini.'

There is here no sign of that humiliation which we are accustomed to connect with an attitude of subjection. Rather does the poet evince pride in becoming a part in the only powerful State which was then in existence.

Then followed the period of decay and corruption, when power was divided between a rabble and a degenerate aristocracy, when misgovernment produced civil war, and when honest men, who, like Rutilius Rufus and Scaevola, tried to do their duty by the subject-races, were hounded to death or exile.

The third phase was that of personal rule, when everything depended on the qualifications of the ruler. I should per-

haps have more fully recognised in my essay that when the ruler was a Trajan or one of the Antonines, the policy of Imperialism, if judged by the standard of the time, merits encomium.

These, however, are considerations which only deal with the remote past. My main object was to enquire whether from the past we could draw any useful lessons for guidance in the future. In dealing with this branch of the subject we have to steer clear of two dangers. Without doubt, it is unwise to neglect the lessons of history. Experience shows that political prophecy, which must, to some extent, be based on the study of history, is perhaps not so difficult as is often supposed; that is to say, it is not very difficult, if the prophet abstains from details, and merely confines his prophetic utterances to very wide generalisations. The French Revolution was predicted not only by those who, like Arthur Young and Lord Chesterfield, visited France very shortly before its occurrence, but, as may be read in the *Memoirs of St. Simon*, by Marshal Vauban, who died at a green old age in 1707. When the second Empire was established in 1851, the course which it would run was predicted by De Tocqueville and others, and it is only necessary to read the classic work of De La Gorce, which cannot be too highly commended to the rising generation of politicians, in order to appreciate the very remarkable accuracy of those predictions. There can, indeed, be no doubt that in politics, as in natural sciences, similar combinations will bring about similar results. If the similarity of the causes can be established, which is generally very difficult, the final result may be predicted with a certain amount of assurance, though here I may add that, so far as I can judge, political prophets, though they have often been right in their predictions, have generally not allowed a sufficient margin of time for the evolution of ideas and circumstances. The fall of the temporal power of the Pope, and the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland, are both illustrations of events that could, without any great difficulty, have been foreseen, but in both cases the

institution doomed to eventual destruction lingered on for a much longer time than was supposed to be probable by political observers. I think I have read somewhere in Horace Walpole's memoirs that he predicted that the system of government then adopted by the Sultans of Turkey could not last for more than ten years. He was right in his prediction, but he was wrong by a century and a half in his time limit.

Whilst, however, it would be unwise to neglect the teaching of history, it is essential to steer clear of what is perhaps even a greater danger, namely, that of being ensnared by the pitfall of false analogies. This danger is sufficiently manifest.

In the first place, we can never feel certain, in dealing with the remote past, that we are in possession of all the real facts. Allow me to draw an illustration from contemporary history. I wonder whether an historian, writing in A.D. 4000, will say that the British electors in 1910 approved or disapproved of the Budget introduced into Parliament last year by the present Government? As we cannot answer that question with any degree of certitude ourselves, I think posterity will be puzzled to give an answer to it. The future historian will perhaps also be still more puzzled to appraise at its right value the relative political importance of Mr. Asquith, Mr. Redmond, and Mr. William O'Brien. Again, will the future historian, writing 2,000 years hence, say that the British House of Lords, in 1910, was a mirror of all the accumulated centuries of political thought and wisdom, or will he characterise that assembly as composed only of gamblers and fox-hunters? He will be able to give excellent authority for advancing either of these views.

Considerations of this nature are perhaps sufficient to make us pause before we try, for instance, to establish a parallel between, let us say, Crassus, and a modern plutocrat who takes part in politics. It would perhaps be safer for us to confine ourselves to the well-established fact that whereas Crassus led an army against the Parthians, and lost his life in the adventure, on the other hand, the most influential holder of

South African mining stock did not command any portion of the army in the recent Boer war.

Apart, however, from the difficulty of arriving at an accurate knowledge of the facts, it is obvious that the conditions of society differ so widely as to render conclusions drawn from analogy dangerous. The mere fact that slavery pervaded the whole political and social system of the ancient world is, of itself, sufficient to establish the validity of this view. Moreover, the objects we seek to attain are very different from those of the ancient Imperialists, and the machinery through which we seek to reach those objects differs no less widely.

The motto of Imperial Rome was 'ubi castra ibi Respublica.' On the other hand, we endeavour, by the spread of ideas, to extend our influence widely beyond the limits of our garrisons, and we are quite right to do so, although I may remark in passing that however high our moral ideas may be, it should never be forgotten that they cannot be realised unless the soldier and the policeman are ready to hand to maintain order.

With the Romans, education was a purely family matter. We think it our duty to take State action in the direction of educating our alien subjects. Again, we are quite right to do so. I wholly agree with that portion of Lord Macaulay's famous minute in which he says that it would be an ignoble policy, and one unworthy of a great nation, to keep a subject-race in ignorance in order that they may be

more easily governed. But I cannot at all agree that the method adopted in India, under Lord Macaulay's auspices, in order to carry out this enlightened policy, was either farsighted in our own interests, or that it really tended to promote the true interests of our Indian subjects. Our machinery, moreover, is different. The records of the ancient world may be searched in vain for any guidance to show whether modern democracy—that well-intentioned, but somewhat blundering giant, which has only of recent years begun to feel its real strength—is capable of sustaining the burthen of Empire at all. That, however, is really the great problem which now has to be faced. That the democracy does sympathise, and will continue to sympathise with the boon of self-government being accorded to subject-races cannot be doubted. Will that sympathy be tempered by a sturdy recognition of the real facts of the case? Will it take action which is statesmanlike, or that which is reckless? Will it, moreover, stand the test of measures hostile to its own material interests being adopted by the communities which it will create? These, I repeat, are the main issues of the future, and, in dealing with them, let us by all means study the past, and derive whatever lessons we can from its history. But do not let us, for one moment, think that any analogy between the events of the modern and ancient world will be sufficiently close to afford an unerring guide for political action in the present.

LORD CROMER.

NOTES

NOTE ON THE POSITION OF RHODUNTIA.

THIS fort, mentioned by Livy¹ in his account of the battle of Thermopylae, is

¹ XXXVI. 16. *ad fin.* Duo (milia Aetolorum) trifariam divisa Callidromum, Rhoduntiam et Tich-iunta — haec nomina cacuminibus sunt — occupare. Appian (Συριακή 18, 19) mentions only Tichius.

usually placed in the mountains immediately above the pass. Kromayer² locates both it and Tichius very definitely in the Great Ravine of Anthela. According to him the theatre of Flaccus' operations is entirely contained by Cato's line of march,

² *Antike Schlachtfelder in Griechenland*, Vol. II, map.

and in this case they could only have been intended as a feint to keep the Aetolians in the two forts from harassing Cato's flank. Unfortunately it is impossible to prove from Livy either the topography or the tactical idea. Little importance may be attached to the word *cacumen*, which hardly supports Kromayer, but he is more seriously contradicted by the most direct evidence which we possess for the position of Rhoduntia.

Strabo¹ obviously means to place it west of Heraclea, which was undoubtedly situated at Sidhiróporto.² That his testimony has been neglected is due, I think, to the fact that most critics, except Dr. Grundy, have concentrated their attention upon the Pass, to the exclusion of the direct routes from Malis to Phocis, while Dr. Grundy, who is besides not much concerned with Rhoduntia, considers these routes to be sufficiently protected by the occupation of Heraclea.

If Rhoduntia is in the position assigned to it by Strabo, it must have been intended as a defence of Phocis supplementary to Heraclea, not as a fortification on the Anopaea. It is therefore necessary to prove the existence of a path through the mountains west of the Asopus Gorge. Mr. J. A. R. Munro³ believes that such a path exists, as does M. Hauvette,⁴ while denying its military practicability on the authority of an engineer, M. Chauvin. Kromayer⁵ neglects the path entirely, but is mistaken in his topographical data.

¹ IX. 4. 13. Πρὸς δὲ ταῖς Θερμοπύλαις ἐστὶ φρούρια ἐν τῶν Στενῶν, Νίκαια μὲν ἐπὶ θάλατταν Λοκρῶν, Τερχοῦς δὲ καὶ Ἡράκλεια ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, ἡ Τραχὶν καλουμένη πρότερον, Λακεδαιμονίων κτίσμα· διέχει δὲ τῆς ἀρχαίας Τραχίνος περὶ ἑξ σταδίων ἡ Ἡράκλεια. ἐξῆς δὲ Ῥοδουντία, χώριον ἐρυμνόν.

² So, amongst others, Grundy, in his *Great Persian War*. No one who has examined the place will doubt Dr. Grundy's conclusion.

³ *J. H. S.*, 1902, pp. 313-14.

⁴ *Rapport sur une Mission Scientifique en Grèce* (September-October, 1891) *Appendix and Map*, in *Nouvelles Archives des Missions Scientifiques et Littéraires*.

⁵ *Op. cit.* II. 140. Das Gebirge noch weiter westlich von diesem Passe (the Asopus Gorge) zu decken, war nicht nötig. Denn es steigt mit von Norden her unersteiglich steilen Felswänden in dem Gebirgsstocke der Pyra, der heutigen Katavothra, bis zu der Höhe von 2158 Metern an, etc.

Without entering here into a minute description of the country, I may state that I have satisfied myself, by personal examination, that the route between the western end of the Trachinian cliffs and the *massif* of Pyra presents no greater natural obstacles than the mule path, which follows roughly the course of the modern high road upon the east side of the Asopus Gorge, and which must have been in use from a very early date. This route of which I speak, ἡ διὰ τῆς Ἀινιάνων (ἀτραπός) of Pausanias⁶ according to Mr. Monro, is commanded above the village of Katò Dhýo Vouná by a remarkable rock, which my guide called Klisóporto, and the natives of the immediate locality simply Vounoús. Below it, separated by the narrow gorge of Vizoutí through which the Melas flows, is a smaller rock called Jamí (the Mosque). At the base of the Mosque are the remains of a wall, probably medieval, which once ran westward up to the steep slopes of Pyra. On top of the larger rock are great quantities of tile fragments of uncertain date, but resembling those to be found at Sidhiróporto and Koúvelo (? Oeta). I believe that they indicate a medieval occupation of the site, and I found no trace of an earlier settlement, except one fragment of black-glazed pottery washed out by the rain.

But it is clear at least that at some period the military importance of the route by Dhýo Vouná has been recognised, and I believe that Mr. Monro has produced fair evidence that the path was used in classical times. It cannot, then, be considered improbable that the path was occupied on occasion and defended by more or less temporary fortifications throughout Greek history. These considerations, combined with the direct statement of Strabo, seem sufficient to throw very great doubt upon the received position of Rhoduntia. In itself that would be a matter of minor importance, but if the position which I have here suggested for the fort be adopted it will involve the forming of a new and possibly a higher conception of Glabrio's strategy.

JEROME FARRELL.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

⁶ Paus. X. 22.

NATURAL ANOMALIES IN ORIGINAL COMPOSITION.

In a paper read last year to the Oxford Philological Society, in which I tried to disprove certain objections to the unity of the Homeric text founded upon the similes, I was concerned to maintain that there was a class of anomalies, or mistakes, incident to original composition and such as are not at all likely to arise from any kind of patchwork of materials from different authors. These often mislead critics who do not realise that such irregularities are actually evidence of unity of authorship. Among far more important instances, one I had in mind was a difficulty I had noticed in Thackeray's *Esmond*, which seems to have escaped many readers and perhaps editors also. I find on looking at my friend Mr. T. C. Snow's notes in a new edition of *Esmond* that the difficulty had not escaped him, but I am surprised to find he has acquiesced in an impossible solution of it. The title of the first chapter describes the contents of the second; the title of the second chapter describes the contents of the first. At first sight it might seem an obvious solution to transpose the titles of the two chapters, and this is what Mr. Snow proposes. But he has overlooked the relation of the title of the second chapter to that of the third. The two titles read continuously, and form a grammatical whole; they therefore cannot be separated from one another. The three titles are as follows:

I. 'An Account of the Family of Esmond of Castlewood Hall.'

II. 'Relates how Francis, Fourth Viscount, arrives at Castlewood.'

III. 'Whither in the Time of Thomas, Third Viscount, "I had preceded him as page to Isabella."' ('Him' refers to 'Francis, Fourth Viscount.')

The proposed transposition of the first two titles is hence clearly impossible.

Nor will it do to transpose the chapters instead of their titles, for it will be found that the order of the three chapters is fixed by the circumstance that the beginning of each of them implies that the con-

tents of the foregoing chapter must have immediately preceded it.

Thus the anomaly cannot be removed by a transposition of either titles or chapters, nor indeed by any remedy short of re-writing the text of one or the other.

I do not propose to go further into the general subject in this note, but I may mention that interesting instances of authors' lapses in this same book of Thackeray's may be found in the three-fold account of the picture of the Dowager Lady Castlewood—Bk. I. ch. 1, Bk. I. ch. 10, Bk. II. ch. 2: in the double account of her ladyship's house at Chelsea—Bk. I. ch. 10, Bk. II. ch. 2: in the two inconsistent accounts which Dick Steele gives of his behaviour at his father's funeral—Bk. I. ch. 6, Bk. II. ch. 2.

J. COOK WILSON.

New College, Oxford.

HOMERIC OPTATIVES IN SOPHOCLES.

HOMERIC influence is especially strong in Sophocles, and this should be remembered in any discussion of Sophoclean grammar.

I. Monro (*H. G.* §§ 305–311) notes the Homeric use of the optative, after a primary tense, in clauses introduced by a relative, ὅτε, ἐπεὶ etc., when the time is purposely vague:

Od. 8. 138 οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ γέ τι φημι κακότερον ἄλλο θαλάσσης ἄνδρι γε συγχεῖναι, εἰ καὶ μάλα κάρτερος εἴη.

Od. 6. 286 καὶ δ' ἄλλῃ νεμεσῶ, ἣ τις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέξοι.

Cf. also *Od.* 24. 254.

Goodwin (*M. T.* § 555) quotes several similar optatives from Xenophon, one from Thucydides, one from Plato (said by Adam to be due to 'oratio obliqua of self-quotation') and one from Sophocles (*Ant.* 666). But there are many instances in Sophocles:

Ai. 521, 1159, 1344.

O. T. 315, 917 (ἀλλ' ἐστὶ τοῦ λέγοντος, εἰ φόβους λέγοι), 979.

Ant. 666, 1032.

Tr. 92 (τὸ δ' εὖ πράσσειν, ἐπεὶ πύθοντο, κέρδος ἐμπολῇ).

The idiom should certainly, as Marchant says (on Thucydides III. 9. 2), not be regarded as abnormal. It is to be referred back to the more 'fluid' optative of early times. In Sophocles it is more common than in other Attic writers (except Xenophon).

2. A final relative clause in Homer can take a present or aorist optative without *κί* after a secondary tense (Goodwin *M. T.* § 568). Surely *Tr.* 903 (κρύψας' εαντήν ενθα μή τις εισιδει) is a survival (or an imitation) of this optative. Similarly:

Ph. 281 οὐχ ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν οὐδ' ὅστις νόσον κάμνοντι συλλάβοιτο.

There is no need to assume (with Jebb) a complicated development from the deliberative subjunctive.

3. In Homer the optative is used to denote 'what *would have* followed on an event which did not occur.' Monro (*H. G.* § 300 C) gives a great number of instances, e.g. *Il.* 17. 398:

οὐδέ κ' Ἀρης Ἰλαοσσόος οὐδέ κ' Ἀθήνη
τόν γε ἰδοῦσ' ὀνόσαιτ', οὐδ' εἰ μάλα νιν
χόλος ἴκοι.

He says that 'this use of the optative is confined to Homer.'

Goodwin (*M. T.* § 443) quotes several similar optatives in Herodotus, one in Plato (*Menex.* 240 D) and one in Euripides (*Med.* 568). He declares that the construction is 'extremely rare in Attic Greek.' Yet there are three instances in Sophocles, referring, however, to *present* time, not to the past. Goodwin notices that *Medea* 568 seems to refer to the present:

(a) *El.* 548 φαίη δ' ἂν ἡ θανοῦσά γ', εἰ
φωνὴν λάβοι.

(b) *Ant.* 504 τούτοις τοῦτο πᾶσιν ἀνδρά-
νιν λέγουτ' ἂν, εἰ μὴ γλῶσσαν ἐγκλήσοι
φύβος.

(c) *Tr.* 55 ἀνδρὸς κατὰ ζήτησιν οὐ πέμ-
πεις τινά, μάλιστα δ' ὄνπερ εἰκὸς Ὑλλων,
εἰ πατρὸς νέμοι τιν' ὦραν κ.τ.λ.

In (c) there is a badly attested reading νέμει, and (b) could be translated 'these *will* say, if they be not afraid.' Jebb however translates (without comment) as though there were two imperfects, not optatives, and this is certainly the natural way to

take the sentence. It should be observed that in all the Sophoclean examples the apodosis comes first.

4. This strong Homeric influence justifies those who emend *Tr.* 114, 115 (where the MSS. have κύματ' εἰρέει and ἰδοι), not to κύματ' ἂν εἰρέει, but to κύματ' ἐν εἰρέει . . . ἰδοῖ. The passage is a simile:

πολλὰ γὰρ ὥστ' ἀκάμαντος ἡ νότον ἢ
βορέα τις κύματ' ἐν εἰρέει πόντῳ βάντ'
ἐπιόντα τ' ἰδοῖ.

In Homer the subjunctive is regularly used in similes (Monro *H. G.* 285, 3 a).

W. H. S. JONES.

St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.

A SUGGESTION ON VIRGIL,

Aen. ix. 353-355.

breviter cum talia Nisus
(sensit enim nimia caede atque cupidine ferri)
'absistamus' ait 'nam lux inimica propinquat.'

NOBODY believes in emendations of Virgil; and if I had any alteration to propose in this passage more radical than a change of punctuation I should not waste my time trying to commend it to others. I wish to leave the passage as it stands in the MSS. and merely to print it differently from the ordinary printed texts, viz. thus:

breviter cum talia Nisus
(sensit enim) 'nimia caede atque cupidine ferri
absistamus' ait 'nam lux inimica propinquat':

'when Nisus thus in few words (for he saw what was in his mind), "Cease we," said he, "from over-much slaying and lust of the sword: for the unpropitious daylight is upon us."'

It is not in Virgil's usual manner to make his parentheses 'inorganic' (or metrically self-contained).¹ And the parenthetic *sensit enim* which I have suggested is, though not found elsewhere in Virgil, a common

¹ Cf., e.g., i. 12, 109-110, 251, 261-262, 268, 439; ii. 203, 376-377, 604-608. Such places as i. 25-28, 329, are not examples of true parenthesis. At viii. 143-144 I am not sure that a characteristic parenthesis has not been missed by editors:

'his fretus non legatos (neque prima per artem
temptamenta tui pepigi) me me ipse meumque
obieci caput.'

retorical artifice in other poets. It is particularly affected by Ovid, as:

cum dea (sensit enim)
'illa deos' inquit 'peperit'
(*Fasti* iv. 358-9).

quos ita (sensit enim) lacto Saturnius ore Ju-
piter adloquitur
(*Metam.* 9. 243-4),
ossaque (sensit enim) penetrat tremor
(*Ib.* 10. 424).

The changed punctuation also removes the difficulty which all editors have felt in 'caede atque cupidine.' This is mostly interpreted as a hendiadyoin for 'caedis cupidine.' But neither this nor Wagner's interpretation (cupidine = avaritia, praedae cupidine) is very convincing. For 'cupidine ferri abistamus' we may compare *Aen.* xi. 307 'nec uicti possunt abistere ferro': *Luc.* i. 355 *ferri amore*.

At Statius *Theb.* i. 148-149 'alterna ferri statione gementes excubiae' exactly the same doubt as to the 'parsing' of *ferri* has arisen as here. Bentley takes it as inf. pass. from *fero*; most editors as gen. of *ferrum*.

H. W. GARROD.

LUCRETIUS, II. 907-913.

sed tamen esto iam posse haec aeterna manere:
nempe tamen debent aut sensum partis habere
aut simili totis animalibus esse putari.
910 at nequeant per se partes sentire necesse est;
namque † alios † sensus membrorum † respuit †
omnis,
nec manus a nobis potis est secreta neque ulla
corporis omnino sensum pars sola tenere.

THE difficulty of this passage is well known to all students of Lucretius. The poet is preparing the way for the third book by completing his denial of the 'secondary qualities' to the atoms with the assertion that they do not possess sense: sensible things are created of insensible atoms. He is at this moment, as Giussani has pointed out, arguing against Anaxagoras, and, waiving his first objection (902-906), is willing to grant, for argument's sake, that sensible atoms could be immortal. Now he puts a dilemma: either they must have such sense as would attach to a single part of the body (*i.e.* feel only what touches each of them severally, so that the sensation of

the whole body is the aggregate of the sensations of its sentient atoms), or have a sense like that of the whole (*i.e.* be each of them a complete sentient whole). In the last four lines quoted, he is replying to the first of these suppositions. Line 911 is manifestly corrupt, and various corrections have been proposed. In reading through the passage recently with Giussani, I became convinced that Bernays' brilliant correction, *nam ratio sensus membrorum respuit omnis*, which I had adopted in my text, was wrong, as this is not a case for the intervention of reason (especially on an Epicurean view), where immediate sensation is available. I also agree with Giussani that Lachmann's *respicit* is 'more than an emendation,' and may be taken as certain. There remains *alios*. Lachmann's *alio* is, as Giussani says, too vague: you want a direct statement that the parts cannot feel independently, but only because they are parts of a whole. Giussani himself would have inserted *animum* in the text, but that he could not account for the corruption. I suggest that the true emendation is the simple one *ad nos*. We then get the meaning: 'for all the sensation of the limbs has reference to us' (*sc.* as a whole), and the idea is picked up and explained by the next line, 'nor apart from us can the hand or any part of the body at all retain sensation alone.' *Ad nos* might be a little strange standing alone, but the *a nobis* of the next line makes its meaning abundantly clear. A blow on the hand, for instance, causes my feeling and not my hand's feeling.

C. BAILEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

NOTE ON PLAUTUS, *CAPT.* 152-155 AND *CIST.* 58.

- (a) ERG, Eheu, hinc illud dolet,—
Quia nunc remissus est edendi exercitus.
HEG. Nullumne interea nactus, qui posset
tibi
Remissum quem dixti imperare exercitum? 155
(cf. vv. 158 sqq.).
(b) Noli, obsecro, lacrumis tuis mi exercitum
imperare.

(a) Professor Lindsay remarks on *Capt.* 153 *edendi exercitus* 'a curious use of the genitive of the gerund. The nearest parallel

is in
Poenus
conferre
notice
parallel
exercit
exercet
the g
regular
eating
seizing

¹ Sin
author
edendi f

The A
duc
Mac
Pri
The A
duc
190
The A
Tra
etc.,
Pp.

THE g
among
of char
fact th
another
three e
the sa
be com
whose
choose
them.
in his
plete e
will ha
a comp
with o
besides
for Mr
pleted,
NO.

is in the (un-Plautine?) prologue of the *Poenulus* (v. 34): *domum sermones fabulandi conferant*.¹ Mr. Henson in his school edition notices the difficulty, and quotes Lindsay's parallel; other editors are silent. I take *exercitus* in 153 to be the verbal noun of *exerceo*, equivalent in sense to *exercitatio*; the genitive of the gerund is then quite regular. Ergasilus means 'the practice of eating has been abandoned'; but Hegio, seizing on the other sense of *exercitus*, replies

¹ Since drafting this note I have found that the author of the Delphin paraphrase has *exercitatio edendi for edendi exercitus*.

as though Ergasilus had meant 'the eating army has been disbanded.' Of course *re-missus* lends itself well to the pun. *Exercitus* is equivalent to *exercitatio* Rud. 296 *pro exercitu gymnastico et palaestrico hoc habemus*.

(b) There is perhaps a similar pun in *Cist.* 58 *noli, obsecro, lacrimis tuis mi exercitum imperare*, where *exercitum* may mean (1) 'army' ('Do not by your tears call out my contingent,' sc. of weeping.—Lindsay; and so Brix); (2) 'trouble,' 'affliction,' according to a common secondary sense of *exerceo* (so L. and S.).

F. A. TODD.

University of Sydney.

REVIEWS

THE ACHARNIANS OF ARISTOPHANES.

The Acharnians of Aristophanes. With Introduction, etc., by W. J. M. STARKIE. Macmillan. 1909. Pp. lxxxviii + 274. Price 10s. net.

The Acharnians of Aristophanes. With Introduction, etc., by W. A. RENNIE. Arnold. 1909. Pp. 279. Price 6s. net.

The Acharnians of Aristophanes. With a Translation into corresponding metres, etc., by B. B. ROGERS. Bell. 1910. Pp. lix + 237. 10s. 6d.

THE great strength that Greek still has among us in spite of changes and rumours of change is well shown by the remarkable fact that within some few months of one another there have appeared not less than three excellent English editions of one and the same Greek comedy. All three may be commended to lovers of Aristophanes, whose only perplexity should be how to choose, if they must choose, between them. Furthermore, Mr. Starkie tells us in his Preface that he has in hand a complete edition of Aristophanes, and thus there will have been published in England within a comparatively short time three editions with commentary of all the comedies, besides Hall and Geldart's Oxford text; for Mr. Rogers' plays are now just completed, and the late Dr. Blaydes' volumes

remain a rare monument of erudition and ingenuity. In this field at any rate England has been of late far more productive than the Continent, where but few editions of either the whole or parts have appeared. German scholars have published very few plays; they have not given us even a new Teubner text. The complete text and commentary of the Dutch scholar Van Leeuwen is the only considerable contribution from the Continent for many years, though his countrymen (Van Herwerden in particular) and others have worked well in various ways at Aristophanic matters.

Mr. Starkie's book is the most substantial of the three before us, substantial as the others are. A very copious commentary is supplemented by a large quantity of critical notes and by an elaborate introduction of ninety pages. More than a third of the latter is devoted to a very careful and interesting study of the little Aristotelian or pseudo-Aristotelian epitome that has come down to us analysing τὸ γέλοιον and giving us all its various divisions and subdivisions. This Mr. Starkie works out in relation to Aristophanes, putting together much valuable matter as to both substance and diction. He seems to me to err slightly in his section on συνώνυμα, for the 'logical definition' which

he gives is not at all applicable to his numerous instances, which are indeed συνώνυμα in another sense.

He has been convinced by Mr. Keller Rees' arguments that there were seven actors in the play, not three with a couple of children, and he rejects the idea of any change of scene in it. I notice as novelties that in 13 he makes ἐπὶ μόσχῳ the first words of a song, 'On a calf's back I did ride,' in which case Βουώτιον seems rather unnatural; 24-25 he has εἶθ' ὅδ' ὥστιονται πῶς δοκεῖς ἔρροντες ἀλλήλοισι; 95 the mark of interrogation follows θεῶν (questionable Greek?), and βλέπεις is not a question. 97 is bracketed. After 318 he supposes an aposiopesis, but then again the words following become very awkward. 634 ξενικοῖσι λόγοις is made to connote some strangeness of foreign style (*Gorgiae affectatione*), but the context suggests only plausible speeches from more or less subject states. 833 Willems' πολυπραγμοσύνη ἐστίν is adopted. 1093 the very difficult ὀρχηστρίδες τὰ φίλταθ' 'Αρμόδιον καλαί is turned into ὁ. δ' αἱ 'φίλταθ' 'Αρμόδι' οὐ,' καλαί ('Αρμόδι', οὐ' καλαί?), i.e. skilful at the Harmodius song. But—to omit other objections—no evidence is adduced that καλός can bear this sense. Mr. Rennie has here hit on the same emendation as I suggested in a recent volume, to read πάλοι for καλαί. Dr. Jackson's τὸ 'φ. 'Α. ' οὐ καλεῖ; seems to me rather forced and unlikely.

Facing his Greek text Mr. Starkie has put an English prose translation of a remarkable kind. It is full of words and tags from Shakespeare, Jonson, and others, by no means the speech of our own day, though the latter is blended with it in a somewhat incongruous manner. It is odd to pass within a few lines (523-529) from 'of purely local interest' to 'a leash of giglot wenches.' Mr. Starkie shows here (as he does in the introductory part about Aristophanic language, etc., above mentioned) an extraordinary familiarity with Shakespeare, but I cannot think his method judicious. It reminds us of F. W. Newman's method of translating Homer, so much condemned by Matthew Arnold. But, whereas there really was some reason for this

method in regard to Homer (cf. Aristoph. *Fr.* 222), it can hardly be said that there is any in regard to Aristophanes, except in occasional places. If the aim of the translation is to give us the same impression as was made on an Athenian, say, of Peloponnesian War times, who can contend that 'O whoreson wretch, dost samples bring, maugre the spoiled vines?' reproduces the effect of ὁ μιανώτατε, σπονδὰς φέρεις τῶν ἀμπελίων τετμημένων? The Greek is entirely made up of quite ordinary fifth-century words, except that ἀμπέλια may be an Aristophanic coinage, though certainly not an archaistic one. The English has three things in it of a very antique kind.

The second book on our list has not a translation, prose or verse, like the other two, and its critical notes are considerably less in bulk than those of Mr. Starkie. The commentary, however, is pretty full and always to the point. Mr. Rennie has gathered his information together very well, and he knows how to put it. He has studied the literature, but at the same time maintained independence of judgment. His vigorous Introduction seems to me of especial merit.

Excellent, too, is the Introduction, touching upon and discussing a good many points of interest, in Mr. Rogers' edition and verse rendering of the play. The notes, as in all his volumes, are much less technical than those of other more professional scholars (though he shows on occasion, particularly in the large amount of critical notes at the end of the book, that he is quite capable of holding his own in that field too) and of more general interest to many readers, who may shrink from the austerity of ordinary commentaries. The *Acharnians* lends itself less, I think, than some other plays to his especial gift of verse, for it contains a larger proportion of ordinary iambics, and in the translation of these it is hard to produce any great effect. Mr. Rogers' strength lies more in the non-iambic parts, though he shows everywhere great skill and judgment. In his notes I am puzzled by what he says about τόνδε in 336. I find it difficult to say whether he is thinking of Dicaeopolis

or of
is sur
assur
Athen
tainly
Am
topha
amuse
place.
tainly

Roman
Em
Au
En
Siti
M.
LL
Dit
FR
Ge
(N)

Mr.
and t
almost
transl
of Vo
has re
blem
speci

(a)
Pasita
lessen

l. 1
broug
p. 56
ll. 32
of the
189 B
but is

(b)
leaves

l. 9
crime
panto
'The
P. 31

i Se
1909).

or of the Coryphaeus. In 126 *σπαρέουμαι* is surely indefensible. His note on 719 assumes the existence of a curtain on the Athenian stage, for which there is certainly no direct evidence.

Among the University revivals of Aristophanes it is much to be wished that this amusing and popular comedy should find a place. As an acting piece it ought certainly to prove superior to the *Knights*, if

not to the *Clouds and Wasps*. But, as far as I can remember, it has not been presented, except some time ago at a certain school, the headmaster of which with great courage cut out the parabasis written by the poet and inserted a parabasis written by himself, with references and allusions to the local affairs of the town in which the play was performed.

H. RICHARDS.

ROMAN LIFE AND MANNERS UNDER THE EARLY EMPIRE.

Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire. By LUDWIG FRIEDLÄNDER. Authorised Translation of the Seventh Enlarged and Revised Edition of the *Sittengeschichte Roms*, by J. H. FREESE, M.A. (Camb.) and LEONARD A. MAGNUS, LL.B. Vol. II. 8vo. Pp. xvii + 365. Ditto, Vol. III., translated by J. H. FREESE. 8vo. Pp. xi + 324. London: George Routledge and Sons, Limited. (No date.)

MR. FREESE'S translation of the second and third volumes of the *Sittengeschichte* is almost as unsatisfactory as Mr. Magnus' translation of the first.¹ A careful reading of Vol. II. pp. 1-130 and Vol. III. pp. 1-83 has revealed over 150 more or less serious blemishes, of which I proceed to give specimens.

(a) Misprints: Vol. II. p. 66 l. 23 *Pasitales* for *Pasiteles*; p. 72 l. 15 *lesson* for *lessen*; p. 83 l. 5 *Festius* for *Festus*; p. 105 l. 1 *Mars* for *Maro*; Vol. III. p. 23 l. 4 *brought* for *proud*; p. 38 l. 2 *ases* for *asses*; p. 56 l. 26 *Aesula* for *Aesulae*; II. p. 62 ll. 32-33 a misplaced comma makes havoc of the chronology; p. 63 l. 25 the misprint 189 B.C. for 169 B.C. appears in the German, but is made manifest by the context.

(b) The translator's English sometimes leaves much to be desired. Thus II. p. 72 l. 9 'beasts, *who* were'; p. 88 l. 3 'many crimes *was* committed'; p. 99 l. 5 '(the pantomimes) *was* connected'; III. p. 68 fin. 'The *Georgica* . . . *was* also a poem'; II. p. 31 'Lucius Verus, *who* was a keen

devotee of the Circus, kept up a large correspondence on it with the provinces, and an over-zealous partisan of the Greens'; p. 44 'He cast Roman citizens to the wild beasts and one man from Hispalis on account of his having a deformity' (Frdl. says 'römische Bürger . . . *darunter* einen Mann aus H.'). I can find no authority for *masseur* = *masseur* (II. p. 123 l. 16), or for 'protagonist' = 'defender' (p. 106 l. 26), or, in recent English, for 'cloth fabric' = *Tuchfabrik* (p. 89 l. 32).

(c) Mistranslations are not rare: Vol. II. p. 3 'Severus even, *next* to Hadrian the most avaricious of the Emperors,' where Frdl. has *nach Herodian*; p. 24 '(Fred Archer) in five races he won had passed the barrier' = *war . . . als Sieger über die Bahn gegangen* (i.e. had had a 'walk-over'); p. 33 'the wishes of his order' = *der Wunsch seinen Standesgenossen nicht nachzustehn*; p. 45 'a large number he despatched . . . to Caesarea Philippi' = *eine grosse Anzahl liess er . . . zu C. P. . . umbringen*; p. 91 'scoffed at by bystanders' = *von mehreren Spassmachern nachgeüfft*; p. 97 ll. 17-25 (too long to quote) Frdl. is made to contradict himself; p. 100 'As masks were worn, play of countenance had to be effected by action' (!) = *Die Action musste das Mienenspiel ersetzen helfen, das der Gebrauch der Masken ausschloss*; p. 106 l. 21 *Ueppigkeit* must mean 'lasciviousness,' not 'luxury'; p. 108 l. 4 'actors' should be 'orators'; Vol. III. p. 2 l. 35 the essential words of 'Italy' are omitted after 'towns'; p. 3 l. 37 'it may fairly be assumed' should be 'it *was* assumed'; *ib.* l. 41 'was fond of quoting' should be 'wanted to quote'; p. 4 l. 25 'later' should be 'earlier'; p. 8 'but

¹ See *C. R.*, Vol. XXIII. No. 6 (September, 1909).

there were still poets' = *aber immer blieben es doch Dichter*—where the mistranslation obscures the point of the whole passage; p. 8 'of kindred peoples' = *eines nahverwandten Volkes* (viz. the Greek); p. 11 ll. 35-38 Frdl.'s meaning is exactly reversed; p. 21 ll. 11-15 are grievously mangled; p. 25. l. 1 'into all educational circles' = *in alle Bildungskreise*—a good illustration of the danger of literal translation; p. 25 fin. 'although at the present day the rapturous delight even of educated Italians in the national poetry is tinged with sensuality' (!) = *wie denn auch gegenwärtig das Entzücken und der Genuss selbst gebildeter Italiener an ihrer vaterländischen Poesie eine sinnliche Beimischung hat*; p. 64 l. 33 'her birthday' should be 'his [*sc.* Lucan's] birthday'; p. 78 l. 19 'the' should be 'their.'

(d) I add a list of mistakes which might have been avoided by a reference to Frdl.'s Latin authorities: II. p. 20 'augurs' = *Wahrsagern* = *divinis* (Hor. Sat. I. vi. 114); p. 51 'was almost proud' = *durfte einige Genugthuung empfinden* = *capio aliquam voluptatem* (Plin. Ep. IX. 6); p. 76 'A man, he [Ovid] says, who touches the lady's hand next to him . . . is often smitten' (!) = . . . *hat oft selbst die Wunde gefühlt* (cf. Ov. A. A. I. 165 sqq.); p. 78 ll. 7-9 Seneca Ep. I. vii. 5 is quite spoilt; pp. 94-95 a story of Suetonius' is garbled; p. 97 'Demetrius was unrivalled) in his skill in inflating his garments by respiration as he walked' = *in-*

grediendo ventum concipere veste (Quint. XI. 3 fin.); III. p. 4 l. 22 'Martial' = *ein Epigrammendichter* = *Domitius Marsus* (Suet. Ill. Gramm. 16); p. 5 'good young men' = *guten Jungen* = *bonus puer* (Mart. VIII. 3); p. 6 'truth to nature' = *Naturanlage* = *ingenium* (Quint. I. 8. 8); p. 27 'As soon as a man has set a verse upon its legs and has drowned a delicate ideal in a flood of words' = *Sobald Einer einen Vers richtig zu Stande gebracht und einen einigermassen zarten Gedanken in eine Periode eingewebt hat* = *ut quisque versum pedibus instruxit sensumque teneriorem verborum ambitu intexuit* (Petr. 118); p. 41 l. 14 'diamond' = *Edelstein* = *sardonyche* (Pers. I. 16).

(e) I might enumerate many passages in which Mr. Freese misrepresents Frdl. by ignoring a *soll* or *scheint* or *wol* (e.g. II. p. 30 'Vitellius . . . owed his nomination . . . to Titus Vinus,' where Frdl. says *soll verdankt haben*); and to these I might add not a few examples of the use of positive for superlative, of superlative for positive, and the like (e.g. III. p. 28 l. 27 'rarely' = *in den allerseltensten Fällen*). Such inaccuracies are often hard to detect, and are as unjust to Frdl. as they are misleading to his readers.

The gems displayed here, and many others, have been unearthed from less than one-third of the two volumes. Need one say more?

F. A. TODD.

Sydney.

TIBULLE ET LES AUTEURS DU CORPUS TIBULLIANUM.

Tibulle et les Auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum.
Texte établi par A. CARTAULT. Paris:
Armand Colin. 1909. 8vo. Introduction
pp. 3-147. Text pp. 149-260. 7
francs.

M. CARTAULT has written a careful book containing a copious introduction and a text of Tibullus and the poems making up the Corpus Tibullianum. The introduction adds little to our knowledge of Tibullus, his fellow-authors and their works, but is clear and interesting, and gives a useful summary of most of the problems at issue. It would, however, have gained greatly by a large

amount of compression and by the addition (a) of a chapter on the metre and style of the authors concerned, and (b) of a bibliography. There is singularly little reference to the work of M. Cartault's predecessors in the same field. There are ample signs that M. Cartault has gone carefully over the ground and formed his conclusions for himself. Nevertheless, he must necessarily owe much to those who have preceded him, and the value of the work to students of Tibullus would have been largely increased by such an addition. For the most part the statements in the introduction call for little comment. There are, however, a few

points of special interest worth noting, and a few also that are definitely controversial.

As regards the life of the poet, M. Cartault places the birth of the poet as late as 48 B.C., and argues that Messalla's mission to Gaul preceded his mission to Asia. Neither of these points are capable of absolute proof, but the author argues his case carefully and well. Further he rightly identifies Tibullus with the Albius addressed by Horace (*Odes* 1. 33, *Ep.* 1. 4).

In the second chapter, which is unduly lengthy, it might have been worth pointing out that the pseudonym Delia (for Plania) is selected because *δηλος* is the Greek equivalent of the Latin *planus*.

The chief feature of the third chapter is the attempt to assign the first group of elegies on the loves of Sulpicia and Cerinthus (4. 2-6) to Tibullus himself. There is no novelty in the attempt, but M. Cartault seems to speak with too great certitude on the point. He argues that 4. 13 and 14 are admittedly by Tibullus, and that if 4. 2-6 are not by him, it is hard to account for the presence of 13 and 14 in this book: two genuine elegies by Tibullus are, he urges, too small a proportion. He also cites parallels between passages in 4. 2-6 and passages in the first two books. But these arguments are evidently inconclusive. The parallels might equally well be the result of imitation, and the argument based on 13 and 14 loses some force, if we assume, as we must if we accept the identification with Albius, that a certain amount of the work of Tibullus has been lost.

The fourth chapter dealing with the sources of Tibullus is at once the most interesting and the least satisfactory. The treatment of Tibullus' relations with contemporary poets is clear and sensible, though it necessarily leads to somewhat meagre results. But the discussion of the general relations of Roman elegy with the Hellenistic elegy gives more ground for criticism. M. Cartault adopts the view which finds its fullest and most detailed expression in Jacoby's article in the *Rheinische Museum* of 1905. He holds that the subjective element was almost entirely absent from the larger elegiac poems of

the Alexandrian age. The erotic elegy of Rome was on this theory due to the invention of Gallus, and found first expression in his *Amores*. (In passing we may regret that M. Cartault should tersely dismiss the brilliant researches of Skutsch as ingenious but impossible.) The evidence, however, in support of this theory is of the slightest. So little has survived of the Hellenistic elegy that such a structure is perilously lacking in foundations. Roman literature reveals no sign of a consciousness that the Roman elegy was in any sense a new thing. Gallus is known to us mainly as an imitator or translator, while Propertius mentions Callimachus and Philetas as his models. There is no mention of other sources, and it is hard to believe that the elegies of Philetas, to mention no others, should have been associated with the name of his mistress Bittis, and yet have contained no subjective erotic element. In any case the theory needs more detailed discussion than is given to it by M. Cartault.

In the concluding chapter of the introduction, M. Cartault gives a full and accurate discussion of the MSS. evidence. We cannot think, however, that he is very successful in his employment of that evidence. The text includes no less than thirty emendations of his own. Of these, nearly all seem to us unconvincing. In many cases he emends where no emendation is necessary, and in many his suggestions seem to us almost impossible. Of the former class we may notice *noto* for the excellent *satis est* of the Ambrosianus (1. 1. 43), the transposition of 41, 42 and 39, 40 in the first poem of the second book, and the repunctuation of *convenit ex aequo* in 3. 6. 9. (A full-stop is placed after *ex aequo*, and the phrase is interpreted *convenit poscat ex aequo Bacchi munera*). Of the latter class we may note 1. 9. 44 *et iacui clausas post ad aperta fores*, while (2. 1. 58) *meritus laus erat hircus avis* is unlikely in itself and in every way inferior to *curtas auxerat hircus opes*, the excellent correction of Waardenburg for the MS. *yrus hauxerat hircus oves*. Other instances might be quoted, did space permit. M. Cartault has, however, made three corrections for which there is much to be said. *Aut hominum nunc videt*

ulla domus (3. 4. 26), *temptatos vertere cursus* (4. 1. 55), *seu tempestiva est sive propinqua via* (4. 8. 6) are all worth considering. Apart from the question of emendations M. Cartault is not very happy in dealing with the MSS. readings. In not a few cases he retains the reading of the MSS. where it seems manifestly wrong, or prefers what

most scholars have rightly considered the inferior reading to the almost certain reading of one or other of the MSS. We would add that at times he seems to pay undue attention to the reading of the *Excerpta Parisina*.

H. E. BUTLER.

New College, Oxford.

EURIPIDES, PHOENISSAE.

Euripides, Phoenissae. Edited by A. C. PEARSON, M.A., sometime scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge, formerly Assistant Master in Dulwich College. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1909. Price 4s.

AN English edition of the *Phoenissae* has been long required. Except Paley—for Porson can hardly be added—no English editor has dealt with it, although it has always been popular in spite of its defects and difficulties. Mr. Pearson is favourably known for the sound and precise Euripidean scholarship in his editions of the *Helena* and *Heraclidae*, which are contributions to that close study of the language of Euripides, to which Dr. Verrall gave a stimulus in his edition of the *Medea*.

To speak of the Introduction first. In dealing with the sources of the story and the plot, Mr. Pearson agrees with the conclusions of M. Bethe as to the *Oedipodea* and *Thebaica*. It would have been well to mention the work of M. Legras on the Theban legends, which often makes good points against M. Bethe, and is marked by lucidity and precision. Mr. Pearson's general view of the interpolations in the play is sound. The end of the play has been the subject of much discussion from Didymus to Wilamowitz, but no two writers agree on the exact limits of interpolation; and lately the opening of the play has been criticised by Dr. Verrall, while long passages in the body of the play have fallen under the censure of Paley and Wecklein.

The general conclusion to which all writers have gradually come is that the play has been worked over by a *διορθώτης* or *ὑποκρίτης*, as Dr. Rutherford would call

him. Yet if the play has been worked over, the redactor lived in a good age: the Greek is not Hellenistic or Byzantine, as we find in some of the spurious work which goes under the name of Euripides in the *Iphigenia in Aulis*. Mr. Pearson comes to this convincing conclusion, that the redactor was 'some Colley Cibber of the fourth century.' It may be added that the writer who for the *Iphigenia* drew upon B to give a catalogue of the ships at Aulis (and strangely added a reference to Cadmus and Adrastus) might well have drawn upon Γ to write a *Τεχνοσκοπία* for the *Phoenissae*. In this connection the testimony of *C.I.A.* ii. 973, which refers to the reproduction of Euripides' plays in the middle of the fourth century, is significant. The suspicious work is excellent of its kind, too good for Hellenistic times, and just the sort which a dexterous playwright, who was not a great poet, would produce. Perhaps we may even go farther and find some of the seams.

To turn to special passages in the edition (Introd. xl). It is more likely that Aristophanes, *Ran.* 1182 sq. is not a parody of *Phoen.* 1595 sq., but that the redactor put into what he thought tragic language the plain everyday language of Aristophanes: he has preserved the very shape of the sentences, just in the same way as the writer of *Soph. Ant.* 905 sq., whether Sophocles or not, has 'written up' *Hdt.* 3. 119, preserving the shape of the original, even down to what we may call the very commas. Mr. Pearson's recension of the text contains many good suggestions. For instance, he clears up 177-178; 312 ἀπαντῶ is ingenious and probably right. But in 186 Μυκηνησί of M points to Μυκηνῆς φησι

(lipography); see Tucker, *Choeph.* p. ci, for -ης. In 202 he rejects too summarily the view that the Chorus are from Carthage; F. Polle in *Quaest. Fleckeisenianae* 1890 has even thought that Sicily is referred to: the geographical difficulties of 208 sq. seem to make the conventional Tyre impossible. In 349 his defence of the 'schema Pindaricum' is impossible; Plato *Rep.* 363A should not be quoted as an illustration; ἐσιγάθη ἐσόδῳ, 'there was silence at the entry,' may be suggested. In 504 ἡλίον should be kept: ἄστρα ἡλίον mean the planets; see Bidez, *Rev. de Phil.* xxix. 319, Pauly-Wiss. *Astronomie.* 236 χορός is impossible. 1116-1118 are rightly bracketed, but to attempt to cure 1120 with αὐχένι is hopeless: the passage is spurious from 1104-1140. He

has cleared up πινός 1377, and rightly has κἀγώ in 878. After 1381 the line should not be inserted from Gregory Nazianz. Gregory distinctly says that the line is his own: ὡς ἂν μιμήσωμαι τι τῆς τραγωδίας.

The notes on the language and the exegesis are marked by strict scholarship and a firm grammatical and metrical touch: the editor knows the traps which Euripides sets for the unwary in his apparently simple language. Practically all the German programmes and monographs have been laid under contribution, and the best points in them have been extracted. Mr. Pearson's edition, in short, provides a fresh start for the criticism of the play.

J. U. POWELL.

Oxford.

TRANSLATIONS.

The Aeneid of Virgil. By J. W. MACKAIL. Macmillan. 5s. net.

Sophocles in English Verse. I. *Oedipus the King, Oedipus at Colonus, Antigone.* By A. S. WAY. Macmillan. 3s. 6d. net.

The Trachinian Maidens of Sophocles. Translated into English verse by HUGO SHARPLEY. Nutt. 1s. 6d. net.

Alcestis of Euripides. Done into English verse by G. W. CORNISH. Fairbairns. 1s. net.

Acting Edition of the Iphigenia at Aulis of Euripides. With a translation into English verse. Sherratt and Hughes. 1s.

The Fragments of Empedocles. W. E. LEONARD. Chicago: Open Court.

MR. MACKAIL'S *Virgil* has been long before the public, and needs no commendation from us. The author has revised and improved it, and brought it into agreement with the Oxford text, except—an important exception—in that he has omitted the first four lines of the poem. Their genuineness has been triumphantly proved by Dr. Henry, if any proof were needed other than the lines themselves. They are quite in keeping with the poet's

character, they resemble other allusions to his works in the *Eclogues*, and they are necessary to the literary form of the first sentence.

Mr. Way has had more experience in translating than any other man living; but we may perhaps carry others with us in thinking that his style is better suited to Euripides than to Sophocles. The style of Sophocles needs an austerity and a restraint which is not always seen in this version; indeed, it is not free from affectations of language. Mr. Way is best in his plain iambic verse: in the lyrics he uses a hurried diction which is often difficult to read. Thus: 'Lie unpitied with none to bewail; their corruption doth pestilence spread.' The sounds have not their proper length or their quality, and the last two words show a fault very common now—they cannot properly be spoken. How much Swinburne and William Morris have to answer for! It is their example which has caused verse to be written for the eye, not for the ear. But we would not end on this note of fault-finding. Readers will find pleasure in Mr. Way when he has a plain tale to tell, as in the long speech of Oedipus on his life (p. 42-44), and the *In Memoriam*

lyrics of the chorus which follows (p. 45).

Mr. Sharpley, already known as editor and translator, begins a new version of Sophocles with the *Trachiniae*. We cannot but think he has made a mistake in using rimed, couplets for the iambics of the original. This fashion was set lately by Professor Murray; even for Euripides it is not always successful, and Sophocles is a more dignified artist, for whom in our opinion blank verse is the only medium. The rime gives a false emphasis which is not pleasing (e.g. 'set' on p. 14); and when the first line of a long speech rimes with the line preceding, which the speaker has not heard (p. 18), the artificial character is too plain. Mr. Sharpley's style is not free from affectations (as 'ere I came to deathwards'). The lyrics are musical; they do not gabble in the modern fashion, nor do they mimic the original rhythms, nor do they play antics. We would instance the pretty little song on p. 20. Mr. Sharpley has an ear. We hope he may try blank verse for his next play.

The *Alceſtis* was prepared for acting at University College School; and the play has been modernised in form. Thus the chorus becomes dialogue, spoken by two elders. So it is often a paraphrase rather than a translation. If Mr. Cornish

went so far, he might have got a more natural effect by making the elders talk in prose. The style of the verse is simple and dignified.

Mr. Norwood, editor and translator of the *Iphigenia*, has cut out about 300 lines of the text. The editor believes that the play is complete, but that the last scene was only sketched, not finished. He calls attention to the subtlety of the character-drawing. The persons are ordinary persons, called on to meet a great crisis; Achilles is a man of noble nature, but bred up to suppose himself a demigod, which makes him futile in his attempt to live up to the idea. Mr. Norwood is fonder of archaisms in his dialogue than Euripides was: a plain everyday style would suit better. The lyrics are more natural; but sometimes we are reminded of 'my brother Jack was nine in May, and I was eight on New Year's day' (p. 13). Mr. Norwood has made an interesting booklet.

Mr. Leonard gives us a short introduction and bibliography, besides his version. His scholarship is not impeccable; he renders *ἀντομαι* by 'I approach,' and some of his phrases are hard to understand, nor is there so much poetry as the introduction leads us to expect. On the other hand, he is often surprisingly close and yet forcible. It is an uneven work.

PRAYERS AND MIRACLES.

Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten. Herausgegeben von A. DIETERICH und R. WÜNSCH. Gieszen: Töpelmann. — *De Extispicio capita tria*, scripsit GEORGIUS BLECHER. Accedit de Babyloniorum extispicio Caroli Bezold supplementum. M. 2.80. — *De Antiquorum Daemonismo*, scripsit JULIUS TAMBORNINO. M. 4. — *De Romanorum precationibus*, scripsit GEORGIUS APPEL. M. 6. — *Griechische und süditalienische Gebete, Beschwörungen, und Rezepte des Mittelalters*, von FRITZ PRADEL. M. 4. — *Veteres Philosophi quomodo indicaverint de precibus*, scripsit HENRICUS SCHMIDT. M. 2. — *Antike Heilungswunder: untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben*

der Griechen und Römer, von OTTO WEINREICH.

STUDENTS of folklore and religion equally with students of Greek and Latin will find in these volumes a mine of useful information. They consist chiefly of material gathered and arranged, with indices; the texts are followed by essays more or less full on the topics which they suggest. Thus, the first book on our list, begins with extracts from Greek and Latin authors and their scholiasts, which allude to the rites of augury, twenty pages only in this case; follows a critical examination of some technical terms, with special reference to Deeck, whose views are on many points corrected.

The
east,
of th
lonia
ancie
Pyth
cusse
their
the s
stand
dark
from
lish, a
The
four p
which
rally r
posse
Christ
New
to be i
found
China.
Rom
to illu
hardly
preted
only ve
but ma
prayer,
instruc
cludes
and the
which
guages
huat iste
prayers
imitate
only by
The ma

Giusep
tica e
Asian
PERGAM
to evoke
rediscov
fluence i

The origin of augury is not found in the east, as the author shows by two diagrams of the liver, one Etruscan and one Babylonian. The second chapter gives the ancient opinions on augury, from Chilo and Pythagoras to Eusebius; and the third discusses the nature of augury, its terms and their proper use, and the interpretation of the signs. The book helps us to understand many classical allusions which are dark to most readers, and it is illustrated from more modern sources, German, English, and other.

The testimonies in *De Daemonismo* fill fifty-four pages, and many are taken from authors which the classical student does not generally read. The ancient opinions on demon-possession come next, followed by the Christians. This book has a bearing on New Testament criticism which ought not to be ignored. Here the author might have found useful illustrations from modern China.

Roman prayers are a more difficult topic to illustrate, because the collector can hardly tell where to stop. Appel has interpreted his duty liberally; he has given not only veritable invocations from inscriptions, but many of Livy's literary recastings of prayer, which are psychologically even more instructive. This, like the last book, includes certain charm-formulæ, exorcisms, and the like, many of which have the jingles which are found with charms in all languages; for example, Cato's *Huat hauat huat ista pista sista dannabo dannaustra*. The prayers from poets and rhetoricians who imitate Greek models are not given in full, only by references; they are very many. The material of the volume is next digested

under formulæ of all sorts, which are then critically examined as to their underlying ideas. This very thorough analysis is followed by a discussion of rite and gesture.

Pradel has edited for the first time certain MSS. of a type that is very common still in the Eastern Mediterranean: collections of Greek charms and exorcisms. The present differs from the type chiefly in having almost no reference to sex. The Greek is not modern, as it usually is, except in a few words and forms; but the charms show the usual nonsensical sounds, enough to frighten any devil—at least one with a literary sense. The religious and other context of the text is thus analysed, with illustrations, from modern Greek folklore and folktales. Schmidt's work is an enlargement (pp. 74) of a topic already touched on by Appel; it is useful, as throwing light on the higher religion.

Weinreich has no collection of authorities: his is a study of the miraculous, in which he deals with various sides of his subject in detail. Thus one chapter takes the lifting or laying on of the hand and other such gestures, in the stories or types of Asclepius, Artemis, Eileithyia, and others, with divine titles suggesting these (Epaphos, Dexion, etc.). Another takes the healing by dream, with incantation. A third takes healing statues and pictures. This is a very interesting book. It does not deal much in theory, but classifies facts.

The value of this series is obvious; the mechanical part of them all is well done, except that the indices are nowhere sufficient.

W. H. D. R.

GIUSEPPE CULTRERA.

Giuseppe Cultrera: Saggi sull' Arte Ellenistica e Greco-Romana. I. La Corrente Asiana. Rome. 1907. Pp. 234 and xlviii.

PERGAMENE art doubtless fails nowadays to evoke the enthusiasm which greeted its rediscovery; yet its importance and influence in the shaping of later Hellenistic

art are only now beginning to be clearly realised. In the present volume, Dr. Cultrera substantially fills up the somewhat meagre outlines of the period which followed upon that of Pergamon, by endeavouring to show that Asia-Minor is the true centre of production of all that Hellenistic sculpture, which, since Th. Schreiber's

celebrated monograph on the *Grimani Reliefs*, and his *Hellenistische Reliefs* has been customarily referred to Alexandria. The young Italian savant disposes finally, it would seem, of the somewhat flimsy basis upon which rested the Alexandrian theory: if the Hellenic picture-reliefs, for instance, need be connected at all with the 'incrustation style of decoration' (p. 4 ff.), that is no reason for seeking their origin in Alexandria which itself borrows this style from the Farther East. Nor need we, because Alexandria was noted for its cultivation of flowers, or because it had lively intercourse with the Semitic East, therefore see Alexandrian influence in the garlands, the fruit, the trees, the priapic herms, the pilasters or columns, crowned by vases or by fruit-laden baskets, which occur so commonly on Hellenistic reliefs. The ritual use of garlands, etc., was common to the whole antique world—so was the 'tree and pillar' cult, which, far from being exclusively Semitic, occurs in Italy as well as in Greece. Not reliefs only, but a crowd of cognate works in the round—such as *genre* statues and statuettes representing peasants, shepherds, fisherfolk; children, old people, and the like, which form in our museums a somewhat indefinite crowd, with no particular label of period or place, are now brought by Cultrera into relation with monuments of undoubted Asia-Minor *provenance*, among which those of Pergamon, and the Telephos frieze especially, hold a foremost rank. The attribution to an Asiatic cycle of the Florentine Niobids, of the Sleeping Ariadne (Vatican), of the Wrestlers (Uffizi), and of a number of related compositions, if not in every case novel, is based on fresh groupings and observations. The close connection of the Niobids with the British Museum disc is once more asserted, and as I think rightly. The connection attempted between the Munich 'Ilioneus' and the 'Crouching Aphrodite' of the Bithynian Doidalsas is probable, but the Subiaco boy (*Terme*)—according to Furtwängler, a copy of the Hadrianic

period after a fifth-century original—can scarcely be brought within the same group.

In spite of the sub-title *La Corrente Asiana*, Dr. Cultrera by no means joins in the present fashionable effort to show the East as sole centre of artistic production in the later periods of the antique, to the detriment of the West. His attempt is rather to disentangle the Asiatic from the Greek, and more particularly the Neo-attic elements. The Roman period was, according to Cultrera, that in which the two currents met and mingled, and we accordingly find him in substantial agreement with Wickhoff (though he reaches the same conclusion by a widely different path) as to the dating in Roman times first of the Grimani, then of the Spada, and kindred reliefs. An important section of the book deals with the introduction of architectural backgrounds into reliefs of the Roman Period.

The immense material, hitherto unsorted and scattered which Cultrera now brings together and thoroughly analyses is invaluable. Thanks to this book put forward with the modest title of *Saggi*, a vast and well-arranged storehouse of facts is offered to students of the later Hellenistic and the Roman periods of antique art. In one respect Cultrera's studies among this later art seem to have blunted his perception of purely Greek quality, as when he revives the unfortunate opinion, once held by the late C. L. Visconti and A. S. Murray, that the wonderful Ludovisi reliefs which show us Greek art just before the perfect flower of the Parthenon period, must, on account of certain naturalistic elements, be referred to the Neo-attic school.

An excellent analytic summary of each chapter is prefixed to the first volume. We trust that in the second Dr. Cultrera will give us the museographic index which would make his work simply invaluable.

EUGÉNIE STRONG.

British School of Rome.

SHORT NOTICES

BIRTHDAYS IN ANTIQUITY.

Geburtstag im Alterthum. Von W. SCHMIDT.
Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann. 1908. 8vo.
Pp. xvi + 136. M. 4.80.

MR. SCHMIDT has given a careful and systematic account of the birthday celebrations among Greeks and Romans, beginning with those of private individuals, and passing to the birthdays of princes and gods. As to the last-named, they were not sufficiently substantial at Rome to have birthdays, and so the Romans were content to celebrate the festivals of the foundations of their temples. Mr. Schmidt has drawn some important conclusions from his material, for which the reader may be referred to his book; notably (p. 110) as to the phrase *εἰς τρίτην μηνός* (Eur. *Alc.* 321) which Nauck marks *vitiosum*. Mr. Schmidt explains the unlucky character of certain days by the character of the gods who were born upon those days. But he overlooks the explanation of the names of the days of the week which may be found in *Dio Cassius* xxxvii. 19 (see *C. R.* xvii. p. 87). And so some of his arguments about the names of the days of the week fall to the ground. Mr. Schmidt (114 n.) follows Gesenius in saying that 'the Jews originally denoted the months by numbers.' But the Canaanitish names Abib, Ethanin, Bul, which the Jews took over, refer to seasons and not to numbers, and the practice of the older writers in the O. T. is to follow this usage (*Deut.* xvi. 1). Hence, it is doubtful whether the Greek names of the months were at first numerical, however the matter stood at Rome. Many readers will turn with special attention to the closing pages of the book where Mr. Schmidt starts from the festivals of the private associations at Rome, which were held on the day of the dedication of their temples, when the god came to his home, and conjectures (p. 129) that the Christian societies imitated their pagan neighbours.

In the history of the Church, the Feast of the Epiphany precedes the celebrations of Christmas.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College, Nottingham.

DE FINIBUS.

M. Tulli Ciceronis, De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum. Libri V. With Introduction and Commentary by W. M. L. HUTCHINSON.
Arnold. 1909. 8s. 6d. net.

WE can heartily recommend this book for the University student. It is quite an unpretending book. Miss Hutchinson modestly ascribes any merit it may possess to Madvig; but this is not to do herself justice. It is based on Madvig, as any new edition must be, unless a greater than Madvig should arise; but it was made by a practical teacher with the object of explaining what her pupils really wanted to know. Hence, it is fuller in dealing with the subject-matter of the book, and does not take so much for granted. The present writer is grateful for Miss Hutchinson's help, feeling as he does that Madvig is more proper for those who have already read and understood the main lines of the *De Finibus*. It is a great relief to be spared what one may call the show-notes in which authors let off steam; these notes are few, and to the point.

WESTMINSTER VERSIONS.

Westminster Versions. Edited by H. F. FOX, M.A.
Oxford: Blackwell. 1905. 3s. 6d.

THESE are the renderings into Greek and Latin verse that won the prizes in the *Westminster Gazette's* competitions. To say that they are by Mr. Sidgwick, Mr. Morshead, Mr. Godley, and other hardly less well-known composers is to indicate their quality. It is, indeed, disappointing that the list of winners includes not a single 'dark horse'—no one who has not been a Fellow or Scholar at Oxford or Cambridge. Mr. E. D. Stone, by far the most

frequent contributor, gives a faultless rendering in Latin elegiacs of Henley's *To an Athlete Dying Young*. Its length apart, the piece rather suggests a Greek epigram. Romanes' line, 'Some novel form of wonder to create' (meaning a new orchid or the like), is done into Latin: 'Quod stupeant omnes, arte creare genus,' and in another version, 'Scilicet ut mira rem nouitate creem'; but no ingenuity could make it intelligible to an ancient Roman. But this is exceptional. The choice of English passages (no easy task after all these years of versification) is notably good, both for intrinsic

value and for suitability to the purpose in hand. There are Horatian and Lucretian hexameters, but no relief from the machine-turned Ovidian elegiac. Surely

'Sweet, be not proud of those two eyes'
or
'Know, Celia (since thou art so proud),
'Twas I that gave thee thy renown'

might have sent Mr. Stone to *Cynthia* for a model.

H. RACKHAM,

Christ's College, Cambridge.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL NOTES AND NEWS

[The editors will be glad to receive contributions to this column.]

GREECE.—Messrs. Wace and Thompson are continuing their exploration of prehistoric Thessaly, and have investigated the mound known as Karamanchayir Magoula, between Velestino and Pharsala. It is one of the largest of its class, a hundred yards in diameter, and the excavators were only able to sink trial-pits to test the stratifications, and to clear a small area revealing some prehistoric houses. One group of these consists of four superimposed, square in form, with walls of unbaked brick on a base of rough concrete. They are distinguished from other primitive houses, such as those at Dimini and Sesklos, by stone buttresses projecting inwards at right angles, one in each wall. In these houses and in the pits was much painted pottery, the lowest levels yielding the now well-known red-and-white fabric; two later varieties seem to be unique. In the later Neolithic period the pottery is coarser, and unpainted. Over thirty clay figurines, some painted, were also found, and contrast strongly with contemporary types from other sites; among other finds were axes, chisels, and flint-knives of polished stone, and clay sling-bullets. The excavators will shortly proceed to investigate another mound at Rachmanti between Larissa and Tempe.

Other operations projected or now in progress are those of the British School at Sparta, directed to the discovery of the Mycenaean settlement; of Dr. Evans at Knossos and of the Italian School at Agia

Triadha; of the German Institute at Tiryns, the American School at Corinth and Peirene, and the French School at Delos. It is also reported that the Americans are to excavate Sardis and Cyrene; the latter news is especially satisfactory.

ITALY.—Professor D. Vaglieri is now excavating Ostia, and has discovered the principal gate, which, as an inscription shews, was constructed by the Senate and people of Ostia and restored by P. Clodius Pulcher. The city wall, which dates from the first century B.C., has also been excavated, and part of the Via Ostiensis. Outside the gate was a base of a statue dedicated to the Fortune of Augustus by Acilius Glabrio, patron of the colony. Another inscription shews that the local Senate numbered 110 members. The water-supply of the city includes a large conduit and a drinking-trough for animals. Numerous tombs were examined, one containing the remains of a young woman with the skeleton of a child in the act of being born! One tomb is that of Domitius Fabius Hermogenes, a Roman Knight and aedile of Ostia, whose name occurs on an inscription in the Lateran Museum.

At Pompeii a new villa has come to light about a mile outside the walls, evidently a country residence, and distinct in type from the ordinary Pompeian house. The walls are covered with life-size mythological subjects. The excavation, begun by a private individual, has now been stopped by the Government.

From
work c
never-e
the ne
Antiqu
both to
being t
of the
a view
ments
angles.
mentall
tals ar
marbles
the res
long pla
its ascer
connect
to the s
of the s
ing mar
recently
In th
model
Civita
glass c
restorat
The arm
cornices
slabs an
rearrang
Vase Ro
practical
fragment
early fab
drawers
accessibl
Third an
of the va
ago is no
same line
Room th
more in
developm
kylikes h
case so
Fourth
been grou
late prov
prominen
Some
acquisiti
briefly no

FROM THE BRITISH MUSEUM.—The work of rearrangement of the galleries—a never-ending task—proceeds apace under the new keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities, the most interesting feature both to the general public and to students being the remounting of the West pediment of the Parthenon. This is being done with a view to the grouping of the existing fragments at their proper relative heights and angles. It was first carried out experimentally with casts, and now the pedestals are being altered, and the original marbles remounted. The alterations include the restoration of the figure of Victory, long placed with the Eastern pediment, to its ascertained position in the Western. In connection herewith attention may be drawn to the sumptuous publication of the whole of the sculptures of the Parthenon, including many hitherto unpublished fragments, recently issued by the Trustees.

In the Terracotta Room an instructive model of the remains of the temple at Civita Lavinia has been erected under a glass case, accompanied by a coloured restoration by Mr. F. Hamilton Jackson. The arrangement of the roof tiles and cornices is clearly shown by the original slabs and by restorations in wood. The rearrangement of the First and Second Vase Rooms on more scientific lines was practically completed last year, and the fragments of Minoan pottery and other early fabrics are now being fitted up in the drawers of a table-case so as to be easily accessible to students and visitors. In the Third and Fourth Rooms the arrangement of the vases made some twenty-five years ago is now being revised throughout on the same lines. In the wall-cases in the Third Room the arrangement is being made more in accordance with chronology and development of style, and some of the finer kylikes have been exhibited in an upright case so as to show the interiors; in the Fourth Room the different fabrics have been grouped more systematically, and the late provincial wares brought into greater prominence.

Some of the more interesting recent acquisitions of this Department may be briefly noted.

1. A silver figure of a lion at bay, from Argos, of early sixth-century date. The mane and tip of the tail are gilt, and the lion is modelled with the greatest spirit.

2. Two bronze mirror-cases and a relief from a third. The first is from the Somzée Collection (Furtwaengler's *Cat.* pl. 36, 93), and has on the cover a repoussé relief representing Dionysos and Ariadne seated on rocks. Dionysos holds a thyrsos, and Ariadne places her left arm round his neck and her right hand on the head of a panther. At their feet is a shaggy-skinned Seilenos (Papposeilenos), with a bunch of grapes. The second has a similar relief representing Victory driving a two-horse chariot at full speed; it is interesting for the treatment of the perspective of the chariot, is finely incised, and in excellent preservation. The third relief is unfortunately in very poor condition, or it would have been one of the finest in the Museum collection. It represents a combat, in which a helmeted warrior tries to draw a nude wounded comrade from the field, and covers him with his shield from the enemy's attack.

3. A bronze figure of a deer from Spain, a very remarkable example of local Iberian work, influenced by early Greek models. The figure is cast in three separate pieces, joined together in a primitive fashion with rivets, and finished with incised lines. The animal appears to be of some species now extinct.

4. Upper part of a marble sepulchral relief of fine style, with a girl's head in good preservation. It is inscribed with the name KAEAPETH, and on the pediment is a Siren, a type new among the Museum examples.

5. Ivory rattle in the form of a sistrum, from Orvieto. It consists of five ivory discs pierced by a bronze rod which is fixed at the ends in two confronted lions' heads springing from shafts in the form of palm-trees; the latter issue from a palmette, terminating in an ivory handle. At the lower end of the handle a lion's head issues from a capital in the form of a palm-tree. The work is early Etruscan, under the influence of Egyptian models.

6. Two archaic terracotta figures of the early Boeotian type, from Lake Copais,

and a figure of a youth wearing a cuirass, from Tanagra. The latter type was not previously represented in the Museum, but there are examples at Athens (Winter, *Typen der figürl. Terrakotten*, ii. p. 237).

7. Six vases of various periods: (a) Bowl of Dipylon ware in fine condition, with a broad key-pattern round the exterior. (b) Pair of lekythi in the rare technique of about 500 B.C., the figures painted in opaque red, purple, and white on the black glaze with which the whole body is covered. On one is a Maenad, with snakes intertwined in her hair, panther-skin, and ivy-branch; on the other, Eos with the body of Memnon. Both are remarkable for the very marked, almost rough, manner in which the incised lines are applied. (c) Alabastron, with figures drawn in black glaze on a white slip: young athlete throwing a stone or ball, and flute-player. Inscribed *ὁ παῖς καλός*. The figures are drawn with much vivacity and humour. (d) A calyx-shaped krater from Euboea, a fine example of the

rare later Boeotian ware of the end of the red-figure period, not previously represented in the Museum. The subjects are, on one side Victory flying with a wreath and dish of cakes; on the other, Athena driving a quadriga. (e) A bowl of Gaulish (Rutenian) ware, of Form 37, unusually perfect; said to have been bought at Florence. This ware is sometimes, though not often, found in Italy, but there is no guarantee that this example was not found in France and conveyed to Florence for commercial purposes.

8. Dr. Arthur Evans has presented two Cretan tablets with inscriptions cut in the clay while soft, classified by him as belonging to 'Linear Script, class B.' One has an inscription in three lines, thought to be an enumeration of stores or cereals; groups of unknown symbols are followed by the signs for cereal (?) and measure (?) and numeral strokes. The other has two sets of numerals, and belongs to the class of percentage tablets.'

VERSION

WHATEVER we are to expect at the hands of children, it should not be any peddling exactitude about matters of fact. They walk in a vain show and amongst mists and rainbows; they are passionate after dreams and unconcerned about realities; speech is a difficult art not wholly learned; and there is nothing in their own tastes or purposes to teach them what we mean by abstract truthfulness. When a bad writer is inexact, even if he can look back on half a century of years, we charge him with incompetence, not with dishonesty. And why not extend the same allowance to imperfect speakers? Let a stockbroker be dead stupid about poetry, or a poet inexact in the details of business, and we excuse them heartily from blame. But show us a miserable, unbreeched human entity, whose whole profession it is to take a tub for a fortified town and a shaving-brush for a deadly stiletto, and who passes three-fourths of his time in a dream and the rest in open

ἐν δὲ τοῖς νέοις παισίν, εἴ τι ἄλλο, ἢ γὰρ περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκριβεία οὐδαμῶς προσδοκῆται. ἐν φαντάσμασι γὰρ ὥσπερ ἐν ἀχλὶ καὶ ἴρισι διάγοντες οὐκ ἐπινοοῦνται τῶν δὲ ὄντων οὐδὲν φροντίζουσιν. οὐτε γὰρ τῶν λόγων, δυσχερῶν δὲ ὄντων συνιέναι, πάντες ἐμπειροὶ εἰσιν, οὐτ' ἢ αὐτοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς ἢ ἄλλων τινὸς χάριν αἰσθάνονται τί ἄρα ἐστὶ τὸ ἀληθεύειν. καίτοι ἢν τις συγγραφεὺς ὢν, καίπερ δύο γενέας μερόπων ἀνθρώπων ἐπιδόν, φαῦλόν τι γράψῃ, τοιοῦτος ἀμαθίας μὲν ὀφλομένη ψευδολογίας δὲ οὐ. διὰ δὲ τί τοῦτο καὶ τοῖς φαῦλως λέγουσιν οὐ συγχωρήσωμεν; καὶ δὴ καὶ εἰ τραπέζης τις περὶ τῆς ποιητικῆς ἢ περὶ τῆς ἐμπορικῆς ποιητὴς πάντῃ ἀσύνετος ὢν τυγχάνει, ἀσμένως δὲ συγγνώμην ἔχομεν. παιδίον δὲ τι, ταλαίπωρον δὲ ἀνθρώπιον καὶ ἐπὶ νήπιον ὄν—ὁ ἀτεχνῶς πνέλων ὡς τεχνίῳ καὶ πτέρῳ ὡς ἐγχειρίδιῳ χρῆσθαι ἀξίω, καὶ τὰ μὲν τρία μέρη τοῦ χρόνου οὐκ ἐπινοοῦν τὸ δὲ τέταρτον φανερώς αὐτὸ αὐτὸ ἀπατῶν διατρίβει—τοιοῦτον δὲ προσδοκῶμεν οὕτω περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι, ὥσπερ εἴ τις περὶ ὧν ἐπιστήμην ἔχει ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ μαρτυρήσει.

self-
as ni
expe
I th
consi
swift
a be
no m
do fo
It
nativ
pretti
garde
offices

Publish

* * E

Bathrens
Edition
Paneg
J. B. V

Bethe (1
Rheini
1910.

Catalogus
carum,
Abhand
sichen
Gustav

Church Qu
lam, D
Spottisw
price, 3

Clari Rom
(1) Agri
Marius
(3) Juliu
John M
leaved.

Curcio (Q.)
Petrarca

Cybilski (St
et Rom
Third ed
eyeletted,
34" x 26"
Haus, by

self-deception, and we expect him to be as nice upon a matter of fact as a scientific expert bearing evidence. Upon my heart, I think it less than decent: you do not consider how little the child sees, or how swift he is to weave what he has seen into a bewildering fiction; and that he cares no more for what you call truth than you do for a gingerbread dragoon.

It would be easy to leave them in their native cloudland, where they figure so prettily. They will come out of their gardens soon enough and have to go into offices and the witness-box.

R. L. STEVENSON: *Child's Play*.

ἀλλ', ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ πάντες θεοί, οὐ προσήκει, πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ. οὐ γὰρ λογίζεται τις οὐθ' ὥς ὀλίγα ὄρᾳ τὸ παιδίον οὐθ' ὥς ῥαδίως τὰ ὀρώμενα ὥσπερ ὑφαίνει τε καὶ ποικίλλει, οὐδὲ μέλει αὐτῷ τῆς καλουμένης ἀληθείας πλεον ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἱππέως τινός ἐκ μάξης πεπλασμένου.

Καίτοι ῥαδίως ἂν τις τοὺς παῖδας ἐάσειεν ὥσπερ ἐν Νεφέλοκοκκινίᾳ τινὶ χαριέντως ὀνειροπολοῦντας. νῦν μὲν γὰρ φυτὰ ὡς γουνῶ ἀλωῆς καλῶς δὴ θάλλουσιν, ἐξίεναι δὲ ἐνθένδε οὐ διὰ μακροῦ δαΐ κλητεύουσιν τε καὶ ὑπογραμματεύουσιν.

EDW. S. FORSTER.

The University, Sheffield.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

* * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Barhens (W. A.) *Panegyricorum Latinorum Editionis novae Praefatio Major*. Accedit Plinii *Panegyricus*, exemplar editionis. Groningen: J. B. Wolters. 1910. 10" × 6½". Pp. iv + 174.

Bethe (E.) *Minos*: Sonderabdruck aus dem *Rheinischen Museum für Philologie*, N.F. lxx. 1910. 8½" × 5½". Pp. 200-232.

Catalogus Dissertationum. *Philologicarum Classicarum*, Editio II. Verzeichnis von etwa 27,400 Abhandlungen aus dem Gesamtgebiete der Klassischen Philologie und Altertumskunde. Leipzig: Gustav Fock. 1910. 9" × 6". Pp. 652. M. 7.20.

Church Quarterly Review. Edited by Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D. Vol. LXX., No. 139. April, 1910. Spottiswoode. 7½" × 5½". Pp. 296. Reduced price, 3s. a copy.

Clari Romani. Series of simplified Latin Texts. (1) *Agricola*, by W. L. Paine; (2) *Metellus and Marius* (The Jugurthine War), by A. J. Schooling; (3) *Julius Caesar*, by H. J. Dakers. London: John Murray. 1910. 7½" × 5". Partially interleaved. Cloth, 1s. 6d. each.

Curcio (Q.) *Orazio Flacco Studiato da Francesco Petrarca*. Catania. 1910. 7¼" × 5". Pp. 28.

Cybulski (St.) *Tabulae quibus Antiquitates Graecae et Romanae, illustrantur*. *Oikta* 'Ελληνική, Third edition. 1910. Paper, 4s.; linen and eyeletted, 5s. 3d.; linen, with rollers, 6s. 3d. × 26". With pamphlet, *Das Griechische Haus*, by H. Larnier. Pp. 30. 1s. 6d. Leipzig:

Köhler; London: Lockwood, 56, Charing Cross Road. 10½" × 6¾".

Dänhardt (Oskar) *Natursagen*. Eine Sammlung naturdeutender Sagen Märchen Fabeln und Legenden. Band III. Tiersagen. Erster Teil. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1910. 10" × 7". Pp. 558. M. 15; cloth, M. 18.

Genethliakon: überreicht von der Graeca Italensis: Carl Robert. Berlin: Weidmann. 1910. 9½" × 6½". Pp. 246. M. 6.

Greek Dialects. Grammar, Selected Descriptions, and Glossary. By C. D. Buck. College Series of Greek Authors. With charts and map. Ginn and Co. 1910. 8" × 6". Pp. xvi + 320. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

Hamilton (M. A.) *A Junior History of Rome to the Death of Caesar*. With 10 maps and 11 other full-page illustrations. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1910. 7½" × 5". Pp. viii + 300. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

Horace (Interpretations of) By the late W. Medley; edited by J. G. Skemp and G. W. Macalpine. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 9" × 9". Pp. xv + 169. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Jenner (Mrs. Henry) *Christian Symbolism*. 'Little Books on Art' Series. London: Methuen and Co. 1910. 6" × 4½". Pp. xi + 192. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

Lord (Louis) *Literary Criticism of Euripides in the Earlier Scholia*. Göttingen University Press. 1908. 9" × 6". Pp. 94.

- Macchiore* (V.) Nuova rappresentanza vascolare del mito di Oreste. Sonderabdruck aus den Jahreshften des Oesterreichischen Archaeologischen Institutes. Band XII. Naples. 1909. 12" x 9". Pp. 317-326.
- Michigan University* (Humanistic Series). Vol. III. The Usage of *Idem Ipse* and words of related meaning. By C. L. Meader. 9" x 6". Pp. 112. Vol. IV. The Myth of Hercules at Rome. By J. G. Winter. Pp. 171-223. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1910.
- Parthenon Sculptures* (Portfolio). £5 15s.
- Platt* (W.) James Platt the Younger: A Study in the Personality of a Great Scholar. With portrait. Simpkin Marshall. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 52. Cloth, 2s. net.
- Prou* (Maurice) Manuel de Paléographie, Latine et Française. 3^e édition, entièrement refondue, accompagné d'un Album (13" x 10") de 24 planches. Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1910. 9" x 5½". Pp. 509. Fr. 15.
- Purser* (Louis C.) The Story of Cupid and Psyche as related by Apuleius. London: George Bell and Sons. 1910. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 154. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Remy* (Edm.) La Première Eclogue de Virgile—Commentaire donné en partie dans le cours de vacances à l'Université de Louvain en 1909. Louvain: Libraire Universitaire. 1910. 9" x 3½". Pp. xx+159.
- Sandys* (J. E.) Orations et Epistolae Cantabrigienses (1876-1909). London: Macmillan and Co. 1910. 10½" x 7½". Pp. xi+290. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Solltau* (W.) Lucretia und Verginia. Sonderabdruck aus den Preussischen Jahrbüchern. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 301-306.
- Student's History of England*. Edited by D. Patrick and W. Woodbarn. London: W. and R. Chambers, Ltd. 1909. 7½" x 5". Pp. xvi+756. Cloth, 4s. 6d.
- Sundwall* (J.) Nachträge zur Prosopographia Attica. Akademiska Bokhandeln, Helsingfors. 9½" x 6". Pp. 177.
- Tatarkiewicz* (Wyladyslaw) Die Disposition der Aristotelischen Prinzipien. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann. 1910. 9" x 6". Pp. 59-160. M. 3.20.
- Varro* (Aids to) Book III. By A. H. Glasgow: A. Stenhouse. 1910. 7" x 5". Pp. 16. 9d. net.
- Walden* (J. W. H.) The Universities of Ancient Greece. New York: Scribner's Sons. 1909. 7½" x 5½". Pp. xii+366. Cloth, \$1.50 net.
- Weigall* (A. E. P.) A Guide to the Antiquities of Upper Egypt, from Abydos to the Sudan Frontier. With 69 maps and plans. London: Methuen and Co. 1910. 7½" x 5". Pp. xxiii+594. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

V
Vis
τ
δνλ
ἐχει
τοῦ
πέμ
δὲ τ
that
and
rega
in o
thir
fift
seve

W
posit
twirl
much
The
and
fold:
of th
disco
repres
Th
spher

1 Th
before
Associ
in The
year.
NO.